

# **MICHIGAN STATE INCENTIVE GRANT**

## **PROVIDER ASSESSMENTS OF PROGRAM PREPARATION AND IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES**

**JUNE, 2006**

*Compiled by*



**Pacific Institute**  
for Research and Evaluation

Funding for this project comes from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, State Incentive Cooperative Agreement 1U79SP0962.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction .....	1
Glossary .....	3
List of Program Provider Organizations.....	5
Completed Assessment Forms	
All Stars/Prevention Works .....	8
Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol/Copper Country Coalition .....	11
Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol/Knopf Company .....	14
Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol/Saginaw County YPC .....	17
Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol/SAC-Battle Creek .....	21
Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol/Upper Peninsula CC .....	24
Creating Lasting Family Connections/Catholic Human Services, Inc .....	27
Healthy Families-Healthy Start/Eater Seals – El Centro La Familia.....	31
Leadership & Resiliency Program/Copper Country Coalition .....	34
Life Skills Training Program/Arab-American Chaldean Council .....	38
Life Skills Training Program/Connexion, Inc. ....	41
Life Skills Training Program/Saginaw Youth Protection Council .....	44
Life Skills Training Program/Wedgwood Christian Services .....	47
Media Sharp/Washtenaw County .....	50
Minnesota Smoking Prevention Program/Prevention Works .....	53
Nurse-Family Partnership Program/Berrien County Health Department .....	56
Nurturing Parenting Program/Eater Seals – El Centro La Familia .....	59
Parenting Wisely/Center for Human Resources .....	62
Parenting Wisely/Copper Country Coalition .....	65
Project Alert/Arab-American Chaldean Council .....	68
Project Alert/Center for Human Resources .....	71
Project Alert/Warren-Conner Development Coalition .....	74
Project SUCCESS/Bay Area Social Intervention Services (BASIS), Inc. ....	77

Project SUCCESS/Center for Human Resources .....	80
Project Toward No Drug Abuse/SAC-Battle Creek .....	83
Reality Check Youth Media Campaign/Washtenaw County .....	86
Reconnecting Youth/CARE of Macomb .....	87
Second Step/Connexion, Inc. ....	91
SMART Moves/Boys & Girls Club of Bay Mills .....	95
Strengthening Families/Arab-American Chaldean Council .....	98
Strengthening Families/Copper Country Coalition.....	102
Strengthening Families/Partnership for a Healthy Allegan County .....	105
Strengthening Families/Prevention Works .....	108
Appendix: Ratings Summary Chart .....	111

## INTRODUCTION TO THE MICHIGAN SIG PROVIDER ASSESSMENTS OF PROGRAM PREPARATION AND IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

The U.S. Center for Substance Abuse Prevention provides funding through State Incentive Grants (SIG) to promote the adoption of research-based prevention programs across the country. The MI Department of Community Health (MDCH) was awarded a SIG in October 2002, and through this initiative MDCH funded organizations in 19 communities across the state (covering all 16 planning regions) to implement at least one, and in some cases as many as four, research-based substance abuse prevention programs in their communities between October 2003 and September 2006. Previous research studies have demonstrated that these programs are effective in reducing substance use among youth and in influencing mediators of substance use (i.e., risk factors, protective factors, and related life skills).

The Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation (PIRE) is the lead evaluation agency for the project. One of the evaluation goals for the State is to assess the successes of the programs in the Michigan SIG communities. Lessons learned from these experiences can then be shared to facilitate selection and replication of research-based programs throughout Michigan. To help disseminate information on local program implementation experiences, the Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program Preparation and Implementation Issues format was developed by the program providers, MDCH, and PIRE in late 2005. Information was collected from providers in early 2006 to enable dissemination of the information before the MI SIG project was finished. Thus, each assessment was completed after approximately two years of provider experience with each program.

The assessment form was designed to provide a concise and user-friendly review of important provider implementation experiences. Each begins with background on the program and the local implementation conditions and concludes with ratings and notes on a set of preparation and implementation issues. These ratings are based on one set of experiences with the program, and therefore *do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the program* (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). It is anticipated that these assessments of individual program experiences will help in planning for future prevention service provision, but it is recommended that planners learn about the implementation experiences of other providers, and review current program information and relevant research to help make fully informed decisions.

Readers considering use of the programs included in this volume should carefully consider the notes and the ratings on all assessment dimensions, and not place too much emphasis on any one comment or rating. This is true even for the overall satisfaction ratings because the notes and individual ratings may reveal important issues that would be more relevant to some agencies and the populations they serve than those issues were to the provider who completed the assessment. Likewise, challenges faced by the provider who completed an assessment may not be as relevant

in another situation. Providers were encouraged to acknowledge problems or challenges, even if their overall experience was very positive. Hopefully this will allow others to identify issues that should be considered when reviewing or beginning implementation of a program.

Included in this introduction to the program implementation assessments is a glossary of terms and acronyms that are found on the assessment forms, and a listing of MI SIG provider organizations with contact information and a listing of the prevention programs that they implemented using SIG funding. Anyone seeking further information about a provider's experiences with the research-based program(s) they implemented is encouraged to contact them directly. If you have questions about the MI SIG evaluation, PIRE contact information is included at the end of the provider contact list.

## GLOSSARY

### General Terms & Acronyms

<b>Adaptation</b>	Changes made to a program that are intended to make it more appropriate and effective in the setting in which is being implemented, and with the population to whom it is being delivered
<b>ATOD</b>	<u>A</u> lcohol, <u>T</u> obacco, & <u>O</u> ther <u>D</u> rugs
<b>CSAP</b>	The U.S. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration's <u>C</u> enter for <u>S</u> ubstance <u>A</u> buse <u>P</u> revention
<b>Fidelity</b>	Adherence to the defining elements of a program; implementing a program as the developer intended with respect to setting, population, and program elements such as number of sessions, content, etc.
<b>NREPP</b>	<u>N</u> ational <u>R</u> egistry of <u>E</u> ffective <u>P</u> revention <u>P</u> rograms (changing in 2006 to the National Registry of Evidence-Based Programs and Practices). NREPP is a resource created by CSAP to review and identify science-based prevention programs.
<b>ODCP</b>	Michigan's <u>O</u> ffice of <u>D</u> rug <u>C</u> ontrol <u>P</u> olicy
<b>SIG</b>	<u>S</u> tate <u>I</u> ncentive <u>G</u> rant, funded by CSAP

### Institute of Medicine Substance Abuse Prevention Categories

**Universal** prevention interventions are activities targeted to the general public or a whole population group that has not been identified on the basis of individual risk for substance abuse.

**Selective** prevention interventions are activities targeted to individuals or a subgroup of the population whose risk of substance abuse is significantly higher than average.

**Indicated** preventive interventions are activities targeted to individuals who are already manifesting drug use initiation or engaging in other high-risk behaviors.

## **CSAP NREPP Categories<sup>1</sup>**

**Promising Programs** provide useful, scientifically defensible information about what works in prevention, but do not yet have sufficient scientific support to meet standards set by CSAP as effective or model programs. These programs must score at least 3.3 on a 5-point scale on parameters of “integrity” and “utility.”

**Effective Programs** are prevention programs that produce a consistent positive pattern of results. Only programs that have a positive effect on the majority of intended recipients or targets are considered effective. These programs must score at least 4.0 on a 5-point scale on parameters of “integrity” and “utility.”

**Model Programs** are effective programs (as defined above) whose developers have the capacity and have coordinated and agreed with CSAP to provide quality materials, training, and technical assistance to practitioners who wish to adopt their programs.

---

<sup>1</sup> The CSAP NREPP initiative is currently undergoing changes including the re-review of all model programs

## MICHIGAN SIG PROGRAM PROVIDER ORGANIZATIONS

### **Arab-American & Chaldean Council**

Project Director: Ann Antone  
28551 Southfield Road  
Lathrup Village, MI 48076  
248-559-0960  
[AnnA@myacc.org](mailto:AnnA@myacc.org)

SIG Program(s):  
Life Skills Training, Project Alert, Strengthening Families

### **Catholic Human Services, Inc.**

Project Director: Kara Steinke  
154 South Ripley Boulevard  
Alpena, MI 49707  
989-356-6385  
[ksteinke@freeway.net](mailto:ksteinke@freeway.net)

SIG Program(s):  
Creating Lasting Family Connections

### **Bay Area Social Intervention Services (BASIS), Inc.**

Project Director: Margo Charlebois  
515 Adams Street  
Bay City, MI 48708  
989-894-2991  
[mcharlebois@sacredheartcenter.com](mailto:mcharlebois@sacredheartcenter.com)

SIG Program(s):  
Project SUCCESS

### **The Center for Human Resources**

Project Director: Kim Shephard  
1001 Military Street  
Port Huron, MI 48060  
810-985-5168, x 133  
[kimshephard\\_chr@hotmail.com](mailto:kimshephard_chr@hotmail.com)

SIG Program(s):  
Project SUCCESS, Project Alert, Parenting Wisely

### **Berrien County Health Department**

Project Director: Donna Payne  
769 Pipestone Road  
P.O. Box 706  
Benton Harbor, MI 49023  
269-927- 5631  
[dpayne@berriencohlthdept.org](mailto:dpayne@berriencohlthdept.org)

SIG Program(s):  
Nurse-Family Partnership

### **Community Assessment Referral & Education (CARE) of Macomb**

Project Director: Lynda Zott  
31900 Utica Road  
Fraser, MI 48026  
586-541-0033, x215  
[lzott@careofmacomb.com](mailto:lzott@careofmacomb.com)

SIG Program(s):  
Reconnecting Youth

### **The Boys and Girls Club of Bay Mills**

Project Director: Ken Hopper  
12099 West Lakeshore Drive  
Brimley, MI 49715  
906-248-3241, ext. 3119  
[recreation@bmic.net](mailto:recreation@bmic.net)

SIG Program(s):  
SMART Moves

### **Connexion, Inc**

Project Director: Herbert Winfrey  
1110 Eldon Baker Drive  
Flint, MI 48507  
810-715-2340, ext. 107  
[hjwin521@aol.com](mailto:hjwin521@aol.com)

SIG Program(s):  
Life Skills Training, Second Step



**Copper Country Coalition for a Drug-Free Community**

Project Director: Taryn Mack  
900 West Sharon Avenue  
Houghton, MI 49931  
906-482-4880  
[projects@portup.com](mailto:projects@portup.com)

SIG Programs:  
Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol,  
Leadership & Resiliency Program, Parenting  
Wisely, Strengthening Families

**Easter Seals of Michigan/El Centro La Familia**

Project Director: Sonia Acosta, PhD  
35 West Huron, Suite 200  
Pontiac, MI 48342  
248-858-5317  
[sacosta@essmichigan.org](mailto:sacosta@essmichigan.org)

SIG Program(s):  
Healthy Families/Healthy Start, Nurturing Parenting  
Program

**The Knopf Co.**

Project Director:  
Jeanne Knopf DeRoche  
P. O. Box 700855  
Plymouth, MI 48170  
734-455-4343  
[Jeanne@knopfcompany.com](mailto:Jeanne@knopfcompany.com)

SIG Program(s):  
Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol

**Partnership for a Healthy Allegan County**

Project Director: Sally Beyer  
3285 122nd Avenue  
P.O. Drawer 130  
Allegan, MI 49010  
269-673-6617, ext. 4856  
[sbeyer@accmhs.org](mailto:sbeyer@accmhs.org)

SIG Program(s): Strengthening Families

**Prevention Works, Inc.**

Project Director: Danielle Sielatycki  
611 Whitcomb Street, Suite A  
Kalamazoo, MI 49008  
269-388-4200  
[dsielatycki@triton.net](mailto:dsielatycki@triton.net)

SIG Program(s):  
All Stars, Minnesota Smoking Prevention Program,  
Strengthening Families

**Saginaw County Youth Protection Council**

Project Director: Cheryl Popielarz  
1226 North Michigan Avenue  
Saginaw, MI 48605  
989-755-0937  
[cnppays@chartermi.net](mailto:cnppays@chartermi.net)

SIG Program(s):  
Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol, Life  
Skills Training

**Substance Abuse Council of Greater Battle Creek**

Project Director: Suzanne Horsfall  
3264 Capital Avenue  
Battle Creek, MI 49015  
269-968-4699  
[snh@summitpointe.org](mailto:snh@summitpointe.org)

SIG Program(s):  
Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol,  
Project Toward No Drug Abuse

**Upper Peninsula Community Coalitions**

George Sedlacek  
184 U.S. Highway 41, East  
Negaunee, MI 49866  
906-315-2617  
[gsedlacek@hline.org](mailto:gsedlacek@hline.org)

SIG Program(s):  
Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol

**Warren-Conner Development Coalition**  
**Youth on the Edge...of Greatness**

Project Director: Nanci Gibson  
11148 Harper Avenue  
P.O. Box 915  
Detroit, MI 48213  
313-267-1119  
[ngibson@warrenconner.org](mailto:ngibson@warrenconner.org)

SIG Program(s):  
Project Alert

**Wedgwood Christian Services**

3300 36th Street, SE  
Project Director: Teri Clark  
Grand Rapids, MI 49512  
616-559-5883  
[tclark@wedgwood.org](mailto:tclark@wedgwood.org)

SIG Programs:  
Life Skills Training

**Washtenaw County Public Health Department**

Project Director: Sharon Sheldon  
555 Towner, HS 1  
P.O. Box  
Ypsilanti, MI 48918  
734-544-6781  
[sheldonsp@ewashtenaw.org](mailto:sheldonsp@ewashtenaw.org)

SIG Program(s):  
Media Sharp, Reality Check Youth Media  
Campaign

**Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation**

Lead Evaluator: Dave Currey  
1516 E. Franklin St., Suite 200  
Chapel Hill, NC 27514-2812  
919 265-2617  
[currey@pire.org](mailto:currey@pire.org)

Local Evaluator: Annemarie Hodges  
c/o Michigan Dept. of Community Health  
Lewis Cass Building  
320 South Walnut Street, 5th Floor  
Lansing, MI 48913  
517-241-1334  
[ahodges@pire.org](mailto:ahodges@pire.org)

## **Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:  
ALL STARS**

**Provider Name:  
PREVENTION WORKS**

### **General Program Background**

Website: [www.allstarsprevention.com](http://www.allstarsprevention.com)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): UNIVERSAL

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): MODEL

Program Description: A comprehensive curriculum for 11-14 year old youth designed to prevent or delay the onset of substance abuse, violence, and sexual activity by fostering the development of positive personal characteristics. Aims to develop/ strengthen five qualities vital to achieving preventive effects: Positive ideals and future aspirations, Positive norms, Strong personal commitments, Bonding with school and community organizations, and Positive parental attentiveness.

### **MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics): Predominantly at-risk African-American youth in the greater Kalamazoo area

Setting: Urban

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: The program has been offered during school hours, in after-school community settings and for youth attending alternative schools.

## Assessment Format

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--“ indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The program has an excellent web-site that provides information about the program design and structure as well as a logic-model.</li> <li>➤ The information on the website was very helpful when researching the program and developing a funding proposal.</li> </ul>
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>A</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>A</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Trainings are offered at several locations throughout the year. Unfortunately, these trainings are not often offered in Michigan. We attended an All Stars training program in Lansing. The training schedule is on the All Stars website and there are usually trainings in Ohio/Chicago but those are the closest. You can pay to bring the training in.</li> <li>➤ The training was very interactive and facilitated well. Background information on the program development and design was very informative and helpful. Each lesson was walked through and tips were given on how to facilitate lessons effectively.</li> <li>➤ The developer has evaluation tools but they cost \$.50 per participant. This includes analysis. The surveys were previously posted on-line and were lengthy for at-risk populations.</li> <li>➤ The training costs \$250 per participant for the 2-day training.</li> </ul>
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A-</b>	
Quality of the training received	<b>A</b>	
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>B</b>	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Kathleen Simley from Tanglewood Research is very easy to work with. She responds to questions via e-mail in a very timely manner. The developers also have an on-line community for technical assistance.</li> </ul>
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>A</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ We have not experienced any problems with participant recruiting although having ample snacks and incentives is a must!</li> <li>➤ Community schools and organizations were very excited about the All Stars Program. The program only requires one facilitator and program materials are purchased from the developers making the program easy to implement.</li> <li>➤ The All Stars program works great in a regular classroom setting. In after-school settings more interactive activities that do not require writing would make the program more attractive to youth</li> <li>➤ The cost for program materials is high. Materials/worksheets for 10 participants is \$70.00 (this includes a \$10 Walmart gift card)</li> </ul>
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>A</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>A</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>A-</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>B</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ This program is easy to implement with fidelity in regular classrooms. In after-school settings keeping the participant's attention during discussions and worksheets is more challenging however not impossible.</li> <li>➤ The participants seem to enjoy the All Stars program. Again, in regular classroom settings the feedback has been more positive from participants than at after-school community settings.</li> <li>➤ The community is very enthusiastic about the program.</li> <li>➤ This program requires a staff person to set up the logistics, assist with participant recruitment, order program materials and facilitate the program. For every one-hour session about ½-1 hour of prep time is required.</li> </ul>
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>A-</b>	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>A</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>A-</b>	
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>A</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>A</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The All Stars program has worked very well in regular classroom settings. It is a bit more challenging to implement in after-school settings for at-risk youth. Having incentives for attendance and refreshments daily has been a key to success in these settings.</li> </ul>
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Overall satisfaction	<b>A</b>	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		

**Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program  
Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:  
COMMUNITIES MOBILIZING FOR CHANGE ON ALCOHOL**

**Provider Name:  
COPPER COUNTRY COALITION FOR A DRUG FREE COMMUNITY**

**General Program Background**

Website: [www.epi.umn.edu/alcohol](http://www.epi.umn.edu/alcohol)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): UNIVERSAL

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): MODEL

Program Description: A community organizing program intended to reduce adolescent and young adult access to alcohol by changing community policies and practices. Full or part-time organizer and strategy team members engage community members to challenge policy makers, alcohol vendors, law enforcement, etc. to develop and/or enforce policies and laws that discourage underage drinking.

**MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics):  
Members of four predominantly white counties in Michigan's Western Upper Peninsula

Setting: Rural

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: None

## Assessment Format

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--” indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	There is a lot of information on the website, both procedural and articles. There were no clear, step by step instructions to implement CMCA.
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>A</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>C</b>	
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Initial CMCA training was provided by personnel from the University of Minnesota. The training helped in understanding how CMCA was developed and what efforts other communities had made. The trainers provided a comprehensive binder of specific materials to be used in implementing CMCA.
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>C</b>	
Quality of the training received	<b>C</b>	
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	Some evaluation tools needed to be revised in order to be used successfully.
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>B</b>	
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	We received technical assistance in implementing CMCA through Linda Bosma, a researcher involved with the initial implementation and evaluation of CMCA. This was very helpful since she had worked on program implementation in rural Minnesota. She also helped us with a community meeting to share one on one results in one County.
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>A</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>It has been relatively easy to recruit agency-related professionals to become involved with CMCA efforts. However, getting the general public involved has been challenging.</p> <p>CMCA has a checklist that should be utilized in hiring the Community Organizer. You need someone who is very comfortable talking about the issue and recruiting community supporters.</p> <p>Working initially with a group of professionals and then soliciting opinions from others during one-on-one interviews provided CMCA agency providers with a clear guide of community readiness, etc.</p>
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>C</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>B</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>B</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	--	
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>The one-on-one interviews are a key point with respect to fidelity. This time-consuming component took a long period of time to develop, and once the process actually began, the list of persons to interview grew exponentially in a short period of time. This, of course, provided a logistical challenge to meet with people on their schedules while maintaining a strict schedule for daily meetings.</p> <p>Community members were willing to give us information about what the problem was, but weren't as willing to step-up and help.</p> <p>Community support is essential for CMCA. Staff enthusiasm is directly related to community enthusiasm.</p>
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>C</b>	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>C</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>B</b>	
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>B</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>B</b>	
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>The non-structured format of CMCA makes it well-received by any community group. Modifications can be made to fit any demographic or level of interest.</p>
Overall satisfaction	<b>B</b>	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		



**Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program  
Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:  
COMMUNITIES MOBILIZING FOR CHANGE ON ALCOHOL**

**Provider Name:  
THE KNOPF COMPANY**

**General Program Background**

Website: [www.epi.umn.edu/alcohol](http://www.epi.umn.edu/alcohol)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): UNIVERSAL

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, and promising): MODEL

Program Description: A community organizing program intended to reduce adolescent and young adult access to alcohol by changing community policies and practices. Full or part-time organizer and strategy team members engage community members to challenge policy makers, alcohol vendors, law enforcement, etc. to develop and/or enforce policies and laws that discourage underage drinking.

**MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics): Members of three predominantly white, affluent communities in Southeastern Michigan.

Setting: Suburban

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: None

## **Assessment Format**

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--” indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

<b>Preparation &amp; Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings</b>		<b>Notes</b>
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	There is a lot of information on the website but it can be very confusing accessing it for the first time.
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>C</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>A</b>	Once the information is found, it is very helpful and complete.
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Training was not available when we first began implementation. We did get training about 1.5 years into the project and it would have been great to have it before we started.
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>C</b>	
Quality of the training received	<b>B</b>	Evaluation tools, (surveys, etc.) that are provided by CMCA are very lengthy and need to be shortened to be practical.  We did not pay for the training.
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>C</b>	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>–</b>	
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	We did not received any further assistance from CMCA after the training
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>–</b>	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>–</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>If you keep focused on the goals of CMCA, this is not a difficult program to prepare for delivery.</p> <p>This program should not be used before there is a very good understanding of the community including its strengths, level of denial and threats to implementation.</p> <p>No materials are required and the website provides the documents, reports and how-tos at no charge.</p>
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>B</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>B</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>A</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	–	
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>Very few preventionists understand environmental strategies and issues. It is easy for staff to lose focus on environmental issues, especially if training is not provided very early in the process. Therefore very close supervision and on-going training is necessary.</p> <p>Community enthusiasm is relative depending on who you are talking to in the community. Community denial in affluent neighborhoods and school districts can hamper delivery.</p> <p>Staffing levels are directly related to the number of communities targeted. We operated with 1 FTE and support staff.</p>
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>A</b>	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>D</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>C</b>	
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>B</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>Even though denial, etc. can make implementation more difficult, overall this program has the potential for broader impact than education or awareness programs. Progress may seem slow but overall change in the role of alcohol in community life has far-reaching benefits.</p>
Overall satisfaction	<b>B</b>	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		

**Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program  
Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:  
COMMUNITIES MOBILIZING FOR CHANGE ON ALCOHOL**

**Provider Name:  
SAGINAW COUNTY YOUTH PROTECTION COUNCIL**

**General Program Background**

Website: [www.epi.umn.edu/alcohol](http://www.epi.umn.edu/alcohol)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): UNIVERSAL

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): MODEL

Program Description: A community organizing program intended to reduce adolescent and young adult access to alcohol by changing community policies and practices. Full or part-time organizer and strategy team members engage community members to challenge policy makers, alcohol vendors, law enforcement, etc. to develop and/or enforce policies and laws that discourage underage drinking.

**MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics):  
Members of three predominantly white, small communities outside of Saginaw

Setting: Suburban and rural

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: None

## Assessment Format

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--” indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Lots of material on Web about CMCA.
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>B-</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>B</b>	
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initially, there was no training available and when it was it was limited.</li> <li>Initial contacts with developers were difficult to get any assistance. We were basically told to read materials.</li> <li>With no training available initially it was difficult to know how materials matched the communities we had. It was not clear how vital one-on-ones were and how they work to get things moving</li> <li>We did not receive assistance about evaluation from the developers. We are working continually at looking for local data to support efforts.</li> <li>A staff member did eventually attend a training as part of the Wisconsin state substance abuse conference. The training itself was only \$187.50 and \$200 for a room. Then a training was offered by the Office of Drug Control Policy in Lansing</li> <li>Once there was training it was helpful and enlightening.</li> </ul>
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>--</b>	
Quality of the training received	<b>B</b>	
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>C-</b>	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>B</b>	
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>C</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We usually were told to refer to materials. The materials were good.</li> <li>Consultations with the developer set up by the Office of Drug Control Policy for the State Incentive Grant project were very beneficial, however we have since contacted the consultant but and did not hear back from her.</li> </ul>
Quality of the assistance received	<b>C</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY	Rating	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recruiting community participants is the core of this model but the materials were not clear about the how to accomplish this. We have had to back-track some but have made progress. Staff needs to be very comfortable with with non-traditional prevention and approaching those they do not know.</li> <li>Qualified staff was on board from the onset. More time needed than realized initially. This model takes a lot of ongoing collaboration -- it is not a model you set up and it's done/ready.</li> <li>It would be helpful to have more strategies to match community characteristics.</li> <li>The low cost and free materials on the internet were appealing. The community survey and one-on-one documents covered some of same information.</li> <li>There was little information, if any, on the costs of implementing the program. We would recommend building in the cost of training now that it is available. Also, with the shortage of resources for law enforcement, funds should be budgeted for doing compliance checks. Money for print materials for the community and retailers, incentive/stipends for "volunteers", media coverage, bringing in resources and project/activity costs should also be considered.</li> </ul>
Ease of recruiting participants	B-	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	B-	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	C	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	B	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no clear fidelity guidelines as CMCA is not a curriculum.</li> <li>• Staff not as comfortable with model as needed to be to do core work of building relationships &amp; support to work on underage drinking.</li> <li>• The educational compliance check have met with resistance in the community, primarily because the decoys are of age so they are not breaking the law, which means you can't issue citations or fine merchants who sell to the them. Some strategy team members did not understand the educational emphasis of the checks. Many say the access lies much more in the parents and older youths hands.</li> <li>• We have found that community members are eager if tangible task or hands-on projects and if it involves youth and does not confront too hard on the status quo. Two of the three communities have engaged and continue involvement. Law enforcement has become more involved and agreed to do compliance checks with overtime payment.</li> <li>• Staff was required to have bachelor's degree and some community organizing experience, as well as substance abuse prevention experience. With three communities at a distance from the office and a classroom program to implement could have used more dedicated staff time during the school year.</li> <li>• 1.0 FTE to spend all of their time dedicated to the CMCA project is ideal. We began with 1.5 FTE's split between this program and a school-based prevention curriculum. We have less staff time devoted to CMCA during the school year due to the hours that must be committed to the school-based program. However, even though CMCA is not a school-based curriculum, it is important to develop and maintain connections with the schools because they are an important center for community life in small communities and can help to promote the program's goal/objectives. We recommend having staff who work with the schools on an ongoing basis for this reason.</li> </ul>
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	--	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	B-	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	B-	
Community enthusiasm for the program	B-	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	B-	
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall we believe in the concepts of CMCA. They are on-target but more up-front training or consultation needed.</li> <li>• We selected some communities that are on the edge of our geographic service area, and there are some variables not easily controlled due to this. We should have started smaller than with three diverse areas, or dedicated more staff time to the project.</li> </ul>
Overall satisfaction	B-	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		

**Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program  
Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:  
COMMUNITIES MOBILIZING FOR CHANGE ON ALCOHOL**

**Provider Name:  
SUBSTANCE ABUSE COUNCIL OF GREATER BATTLE CREEK**

**General Program Background**

Website: [www.epi.umn.edu/alcohol](http://www.epi.umn.edu/alcohol)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): UNIVERSAL

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, promising): MODEL

Program Description: A community organizing program intended to reduce adolescent and young adult access to alcohol by changing community policies and practices. Full or part-time organizer and strategy team members engage community members to challenge policy makers, alcohol vendors, law enforcement, etc. to develop and/or enforce policies and laws that discourage underage drinking.

**MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics):  
Members of the racially diverse greater Battle Creek area.

Setting: Urban & suburban

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: None



## Assessment Format

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--” indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Information about the CMCA program was not difficult to find. The information we found was accurate. The manual is easy to understand
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>B</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>A</b>	
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	We tried to obtain training early on but communication was difficult and trainings were not held statewide.  Training was arranged by the Office of Drug Control Policy and provided by personnel from the University of Minnesota about a year and a half after we began the program. We then learned that the One-On-One Surveys needed to be completed but at that point we already had a large, eager group formed. Had we known about the One-On-Ones from the beginning they could have been incorporated.  Once training was brought to Lansing, travel was the only cost. The training was helpful and informative, but it was offered too late to be fully effective. The one-on-ones, in particular, were an element we wish we would have received training on earlier.
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>C</b>	
Quality of the training received	<b>A</b>	
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>B</b>	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	We did not ask for or receive additional training or post-training support.  We did receive technical assistance from a program consultant, Linda Bosma, in Lansing. This was helpful as she provided many samples of materials that were useful and we did not have to completely create them.
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	--	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>A</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>A</b>	We had already started an underage drinking prevention forum with key leaders at the table. This provided a great base and made recruiting easier. We already had qualified staff members and collaborators were already on board. We needed more space, but that was easy to obtain.
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>A</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>A</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>B</b>	Many goals concerning changes in ordinances and laws were not obtainable during the life of the grant. However, we made progress toward these goals and made people aware of existing laws.
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	As there are only guidelines with CMCA, implementing with fidelity is doable. Compliance checks have gone quite smoothly following CMCA guidelines.
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>A</b>	Staff enthusiasm has been high.
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>A</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>A</b>	
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>A</b>	SAC conducted a town hall meeting on underage drinking the year before we began the program, and it was well attended. The community and media have been enthusiastic about working together on this issue.
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	This model appears to be a good match for our county needs. The Underage Drinking Prevention Forum had been started as there was a community need and understanding that something must be done in this realm.
Overall satisfaction	<b>A</b>	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		

## **Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:**  
**COMMUNITIES MOBILIZING FOR CHANGE ON ALCOHOL**

**Provider Name:**  
**UPPER PENINSULA COMMUNITY COALITIONS**

### **General Program Background**

Website: [www.epi.umn.edu/alcohol](http://www.epi.umn.edu/alcohol)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): UNIVERSAL

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): MODEL

Program Description: A community organizing program intended to reduce adolescent and young adult access to alcohol by changing community policies and practices. Full or part-time organizer and strategy team members engage community members to challenge policy makers, alcohol vendors, law enforcement, etc. to develop and/or enforce policies and laws that discourage underage drinking.

### **MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics): Members of six several predominantly white counties/communities in the Central & Eastern Upper Peninsula of Michigan, including Marquette, Delta, Menominee, Schoolcraft and Chippewa Counties. Each of these areas have established or maintained Substance Abuse Prevention Coalitions.

Setting: Suburban & rural

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: This site implemented a coalition of coalitions model, thus coordination of the project was somewhat decentralized. Aspects of the program varied depending on the priorities of the six coalitions involved. In addition, state and local surveys indicate that the region has very high substance abuse rates among both youth and children. In some of the counties, the binge drinking rate is 30 to 50% higher than state averages.

### **Assessment Format**

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--“ indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	The CMCA Model has an excellent training manual. There is also available on the Web site. (There is also what available on the web site?) Some of the information is dated. However, much of the information is still relevant. The manual also provides step-by-step information on the key components of the environmental change policies that are necessary to reduce youth access to alcohol.
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>A</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>A-</b>	
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	The State arranged for an initial training of the CMCA model. The training was very well done and attendees received a CMCA Manual. In addition, the State also arranged for a training held locally with a CMCA Qualified trainer in the spring of 2005. This training was video-conferenced to the East UP area at the same time, and the only cost for both projects was travel related expenses.
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>B</b>	
Quality of the training received	<b>A-</b>	
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>B</b>	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>B</b>	We have not utilized additional training from the program developers. We feel adequately trained and the information supplied is easily followed.
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>--</b>	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>--</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>The CMCA Model is formed around the development of a local coalition. It is not difficult to recruit coalition members, but it is a task to be able to get them to attend meetings. However, we have adapted a report form that is easy to complete and allows us to capture prevention work from our Coalition members.</p> <p>It has been easy to adapt the program for our local needs as the manual itself provides latitude for local approaches. It provides several different solutions for programming issues for local communities. To date, very little funding has been necessary for this adaptation. We have spent \$300 (largely for copy and mailing expenses) for the program.</p>
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>B</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>B</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>B</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	<p>As stated previously, this model provides general program recommendations and guidance. For example, we have been able to take the key components from an Alcohol Beverage Server Training Program and adapt key recommendations to allow for a localized approach to this issue by offering LOW cost and time involvement with the training. Also, the compliance check information has also been followed with local forms utilized to document visits. Several town meetings with alcohol retailers have been held with positive results. The value to staff is that this model provides quick resources and guidance to environmental and community approaches to reducing youth access to alcohol. We fund five local coalitions with five part time staff.</p>
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>B</b>	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>B</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>B</b>	
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>B</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>A-</b>	<p>This model is appropriate for our region. It was developed in Minnesota which is of similar demographics. It also targets youth access issues which is a community concern.</p>
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Overall satisfaction	<b>A-</b>	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		

## **Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:  
CREATING LASTING FAMILY CONNECTIONS**

**Provider Name:  
CATHOLIC HUMAN SERVICES, INC.**

### **General Program Background**

Website: [www.copes.org](http://www.copes.org)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): UNIVERSAL, SELECTIVE, INDICATED

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): MODEL

Program Description: A prevention program for families with youth 9-17 years old that provides parents and children with defenses against environmental risk factors for substance abuse and violence. Can be implemented through schools, social service agencies, faith organizations, etc. Consists of training modules addressing substance abuse, personal and family responsibilities, and communication and refusal skills. Facilitators also provide early intervention services and follow-up case management to connect families to resources in the community.

### **MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics): Predominantly white parents and youth, ages 12-17

Setting: Four Northern Michigan counties, including small communities in and around Alpena (Northeastern Lower Peninsula)

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: Youth in this implementation were court-ordered to participate with their families in the CLFC program. Catholic Human Services experienced some difficulty securing referrals for the program and retaining participants.

## Assessment Format

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--” indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Original information on CLFC was found in the SAMHSA reference book on programs and there is also information on the CSAP website on model programs.
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>A</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>A</b>	
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Ease of Training:</b> Training for this program is out of state and held when there is enough participants to run the session; training lasts for five days; cost is \$750 per facilitator plus transportation, room and board. <b>Quality of Training:</b> Facilitators that attended the training reported they did feel qualified to run the program upon completion, but it was too long for the information and skills taught and did not create enthusiasm for the materials. <b>Evaluation and Support:</b> The evaluation surveys put out by CLFC appear to be very complete and well written, however our program used the required SIG evaluation instruments. <b>Value of Training:</b> Facilitators felt the training was necessary to understand the methods and goals of the programs especially for the communications module, however we decided not to send other facilitators for training due to cost vs value.
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>C</b>	
Quality of the training received	<b>C</b>	
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>C</b>	
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Developer's staff was quick (within 24 hours) to respond to any email or phone questions. Developer has begun an on line newsletter that deals with CLFC and has comments and suggestions from facilitators using the materials across the nation.
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>A</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p><b>Recruitment:</b> It was very difficult for us to get enough participants (six minimum for both parents and youth) to run the 16-20 session program. Two environmental issues that added to that difficulty were a low-density population in rural counties and the fact that we only targeted court referred families.</p> <p><b>Logistics:</b> Educational facilities were chosen for locations since the program requires two rooms per session and availability for 16-20 sessions. Transportation was an issue at times due to rural and economically deprived area.</p> <p><b>Value of Materials:</b> The complete package for enough materials to run the program for 25 participants is \$1,125.00. The manuals and posters, which are very well done, are reusable. Participants' workbooks would be \$12/program and have mixed reviews from lead facilitators on their value. Facilitators note that the youth segments are repetitive and do not have enough material for the time planned and needed to bring in additional materials.</p>
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>D</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>A</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>A</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>C</b>	



Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p><b>Implementing with fidelity:</b> The main problem with fidelity was in obtaining and retaining at least six participants in each group (parent and youth) for the entire 16-20 session program. Some of the participants did not complete the entire program thus having the six participants at each session wasn't possible. Youth involved in the program violate one of the aspects of their probation and they get sent to juvenile detention facilities for several weeks. Or parents did something so that they lose custody and the child is moved out of the area. Lack of participants in a program that requires group discussions and role-play was very difficult, plus we were working with court-mandated families that did not want to be attending. Additionally, case management is a component of this model program, but no parameters were established on how, when or what model to use to case manage.</p> <p><b>Staff enthusiasm:</b> Varies. One county's facilitators are very positive; like the materials, have excellent retention, strong community and court support. Two other county facilitators struggle with retention of participants and would like to offer a shorter program with more parenting skills.</p> <p><b>Participant interest:</b> Due to the length of the program (16-20 sessions) we find participants resentful and uncooperative for usually the first five sessions. Once a group relationship is in place, interest and attendance improves.</p> <p><b>Community enthusiasm:</b> One county has strong community support meeting participant numbers easily for fidelity. Other counties prefer a shorter program for their cases and it is difficult to obtain the required number of referrals for fidelity.</p> <p><b>Value of Staff Time:</b> Estimated cost of implementing one session of CLFC program with fidelity runs \$570. This includes coordinator time, facilitator time, supplies and food. It does not include any expenses associated to agency operations such as supervision, rent, accounting, phones, mileage, etc. Nor does it include direct and or indirect hours put in by the lead facilitators on case management and reporting to court officials. That is \$11,400 for the implementation of a full 20 session series.</p>
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>C</b>	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>B</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>B</b>	
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>C</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>C</b>	
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>Reports from the court systems that have used CLFC have been favorable for those families that complete the program, however, the cost to have four facilitators on site for the program, length of the complete program, difficulty in obtaining referrals and retention will not allow the agency to continue this program with fidelity after the SIG funding expires.</p>
Overall satisfaction	<b>C</b>	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		

## **Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:**  
**HEALTHLY FAMILIES/HEALTHY START**

**Provider Name:**  
**EASTER SEALS – EL CENTRO LA FAMILIA**

### **General Program Background**

Website: <http://www.strengtheningfamilies.org/>

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): SELECTIVE

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): Not Applicable

Program Description: A voluntary home visiting program primarily designed to prevent negative pregnancy and birth outcomes, child abuse and neglect, and stresses the importance of a drug-free pregnancy and household. Family Support Workers (FSWs) begin work with mothers (and families) prior to the birth of a child or within 90 days of birth up to 5 years of age. They help establish support networks, teach prenatal care and nutrition, enhance positive parent-child interaction, and provide referrals to other services.

### **MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics): The participants were young Hispanic/Latino families with one or two children, ages 0-4 years old

Setting: Pontiac/Metro Detroit

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: Program implemented by bilingual staff, to deliver culturally appropriate services to participants.

## **Assessment Format**

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--” indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Information can be found in the web site
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>A</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>A</b>	
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Trainings are usually one week long, comprehensive and inexpensive (\$ 200). Formal trainings from HSHF America may happen only twice a year, so frequency of trainings may be an issue.  Quality is very good, especially because all FSWs are required to engage in ongoing training for at least 60 hours of CE a year. Many trainings are offered in kind by parent agency. Implementation is very closely supervised. Staff gets individual as well as group feedback about the families they serve.  We still need some tools to measure growth on participants in other areas not measured by the current outcomes tools. We just heard from the evaluator at HF- Arizona that they have developed a parenting inventory whose target is the home-visiting programs and is used along with the Adult-Adolescent Parenting Inventory.
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>B</b>	
Quality of the training received	<b>A</b>	
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>B</b>	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Technical assistance is easy to obtain, people call back right away and provide help
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>A</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>A</b>	We sometimes have waiting lists of people wanting to participate
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>B</b>	It is always a challenge to recruit bilingual staff with knowledge of parenting skills. However, we have been able to hire bachelor's and master's prepared staff.
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>A</b>	Program has been implemented with Hispanic families.
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	Materials are not expensive and actually parents are taught how to create toys and educational materials for their children.
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>A</b>	The program is very structured and materials are easy to follow. It has been used with Hispanic families so there is no need to make adaptations.
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>A</b>	Staff gets encouraged by the growth they see in their clients even though providing home-based services can be very challenging.
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>A</b>	Participants are engaged at a time when they feel more vulnerable (e.g, new parents) and they are eager to learn and get assistance. Program is completely voluntary and retention is almost 100%.
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>B</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>B</b>	Community (mainly local hospitals) are eager to refer their Spanish-speaking clients when they see that they need support and education. However, they get disappointed when we cannot always accept their referrals based on limited capacity and eligibility guidelines (no more than 2 children in home). Each FSW serves between 15 to 18 families at any time. This caseload allows for weekly visits for the new clients. After 6 months, frequency could change to every other week.
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Overall satisfaction	<b>A</b>	Program is geared towards high risk families. Services are provided in the home. Materials are provided by the program to share with the families (e.g., toys, educational software).
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		

**Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program  
Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:  
LEADERSHIP AND RESILIENCY PROGRAM**

**Provider Name:  
COPPER COUNTRY COALITION FOR A DRUG FREE COMMUNITY**

**General Program Background**

Website: [www.co.fairfax.va.us/service/csb/homepage.htm](http://www.co.fairfax.va.us/service/csb/homepage.htm)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): SELECTIVE, INDICATED

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): MODEL

Program Description: A school or community-based substance abuse prevention program for youth 14-19 years old who have exhibited behavioral/disciplinary problems including absenteeism, poor grades, substance use, and violence. Program components include: Resiliency Group, Alternative Adventure Activities, & Community Service. Ideally participation spans 9th-12th grade.

**MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics): Male and female predominantly white youth, ages 13-18

Setting: Four small high schools in Western Upper Peninsula communities

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: None

## Assessment Format

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--” indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	We were able to find information on the SAMHSA website regarding the program.
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>B</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>B</b>	
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	When the grant was written, LRP did not have a required training component to implementation. The developers implemented a mandatory training to implement LRP as of October 1, 2003. The LRP training was a comprehensive, hands-on, multi-day experience provided by the program developer. The training is valuable, but cost around \$6,000 plus trainer's travel expenses to have her come to our site. She trained 10, but we could have up to 20 participants. Trainings are offered all over the US. After the initial training we hosted a staff member went to Pennsylvania where another agency was having their staff trained. The registration was \$300, and it cost about \$1000 for hotel, rental car, airfare, etc.  There are a lot of evaluation tools available as part of the training and materials.
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>C</b>	
Quality of the training received	<b>A</b>	
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>B</b>	
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	There were changes in training requirements, and in program development staff, so receiving answers to questions wasn't always timely.
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>B</b>	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>B</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY	Rating	<p>Initial program recruitment in Year 1 proved difficult, because we weren't able to receive the required training until five months into the year. Once the program had been up and running, word of mouth among students made the recruitment process much easier.</p> <p>There are three main components to the program. Process groups in the school, Alternative Adventure Activities out of school hours and Community/Volunteer Activities out of school hours. It is very difficult to schedule the out of school activities to get 100% group participation due to student extra-curricular activities and jobs.</p> <p>The geographic distance between the four high schools in three counties serviced by the provider agency created challenges for scheduling all school meetings, adventure outings, and community service activities.</p> <p>No real required materials. We did purchase some books on process groups and mandalas. This program gives you no curriculum, but lots of idea of what you can do with the program participants. One idea is mandalas (graphic designs decorated by the students), another is masks, puppet shows, etc. Depending on what you pick to do. . .there is additional costs incurred. We also purchased the puppets, but off the top of my head I don't remember how much they were. But again, all of these are optional costs.</p>
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>B</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>C</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>B</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>C</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>There are a lot of components to the program. During the required training, trainers work with the group to brainstorm appropriate local resources and programs for Community Service and Alternative Adventure Activities.</p> <p>It is imperative that staff have a clinical background to implement the program. A clinician with group experience would be preferred. Many times they have to have some prepared options for the process group to “get it going”.</p> <p>Participants seem to like the out of school activities, but the process group can be challenging. Especially, if members of the group aren’t getting along. Also, the program needs to decide how it will deal with teen substance use, since this is a prevention program, and one of the requirements is non-use.</p> <p>This program requires a lot of staff time to implement with a small number of participants. This includes one hour a week for process groups, and alternative adventure activities and volunteer activities once a month for about four hours each.</p> <p>One of our staff members facilitates LRP in the four high schools. While four programs create challenges and necessitate creative scheduling, having several programs to facilitate reduces the required implementation time. Indirect time is significantly reduced as each planned activity can be applied to all four groups. Staff running four groups is about .5 to .75 FTE.</p>
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>C</b>	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>B</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>B</b>	
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>C</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>D</b>	
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>The groups are small, and as stated above the program requires a lot of staff time. It seems unreasonable that long-term, positive change will happen with 6-7 students in a high school by one hour a week, and after school activities twice a month. There has been some individual change, but no change in the school environment with the program.</p>
Overall satisfaction	<b>C</b>	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		



## **Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:  
LIFE SKILLS TRAINING PROGRAM**

**Provider Name:  
ARAB-AMERICAN CHALDEAN COUNCIL**

### **General Program Background**

Website: [www.lifeskillstraining.com](http://www.lifeskillstraining.com)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): UNIVERSAL

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): MODEL

Program Description: A school-based substance abuse prevention curriculum for youth ages 11-14 that seeks to influence major social and psychological factors that promote the initiation and early use of substances, targeting youth who have not initiated substance use. The middle school curriculum consists of three major components: 1) Drug Resistance Skills, 2) Personal Self-management Skills, and 3) General Social Skills.

### **MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics): Male and female, predominantly African-American & Arab-American/Chaldean middle school youth, ages 11-14

Setting: Socio-economically stressed region of Detroit, and nearby regions where the target Arab/Chaldean population resides

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: Some of the schools where the program was implemented insisted upon the exclusion of materials related to substance use and social interaction between boys and girls to conform to the cultural standards of the Arab-American families they serve. They have allowed increasing exposure to these materials as the agency has demonstrated sensitivity to cultural norms and an ability to present materials in a professional manner.

## **Assessment Format**

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--” indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Information on the LST program is relatively easy to find online and the information is accurate.
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>B</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>B</b>	
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	The staff who work on the SIG grant were trained on the LST program by other ACC prevention staff who had been trained years earlier. They did not attend the formal training that is available through Life Skills. However, staff has received exceptional support from the program developers.
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	--	
Quality of the training received	--	
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	--	
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Representatives from the LST program are very helpful when assistance is needed. They always respond quickly and are very good at providing the information that we have requested in a timely manner. Also they are always able to answer any questions that we might have and provide feedback when necessary.
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>A</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>For the most part the schools in which we are implementing the LST program have been very cooperative. In two of the schools we had to eliminate three of the lessons due to cultural concerns. The program was easily adaptable for the few modifications that we needed to make. These modifications included translating the materials for students that were new to the country.</p> <p>The staff that was needed for program implementation was available and had the necessary time to prepare for each lesson and the materials that were needed for the program.</p> <p>Our expenses for materials were not high because we used copies of LST program materials that were previously purchased by us from the developers. However, we have since learned that the developers do not allow duplication of materials without specific permission, and therefore our expenses in the future might be greater than what we experienced through this project. As a suggestion on how costs may be reduced, the developers do allow use of their workbooks as guides that can be reused across classes and years; students simply do their individual writing in a separate notebook.</p>
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>B</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>B</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>B</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>B</b>	
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>The LST program was not difficult to implement. Staff felt that the Teacher's Manual provided clear understanding and necessary information to help maintain fidelity of the program.</p> <p>Overall, the staff members were very pleased with the program and the topics covered, but they were more enthusiastic about some of the lessons than others. Lessons about smoking, alcohol, and marijuana, along with those that covered conflict resolution and violence in the media were exceptional.</p> <p>The students that participated in the program were very interested in some of the lessons, such as, smoking, alcohol, marijuana, and the three lessons dealing with anger and conflict resolution. When implementing some of the other lessons it was sometimes difficult to keep the students on task.</p> <p>Overall, it appeared that school administrators and the students that participated were pleased with the program and found it to be valuable.</p> <p>For the time required to conduct each lesson, we felt that the staff time required was very suitable.</p>
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>A</b>	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>B</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>C</b>	
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>B</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>B</b>	
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>The participants demonstrated increased knowledge and the development of resistance skills to using substances. In future implementation of this program, we feel that it will be important to create more situations for the students to practice what they learn in each lesson.</p>
Overall satisfaction	<b>B</b>	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		

## **Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:  
LIFE SKILLS TRAINING PROGRAM**

**Provider Name:  
CONNEXION, INC.**

### **General Program Background**

Website: [www.lifeskillstraining.com](http://www.lifeskillstraining.com)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): UNIVERSAL

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): MODEL

Program Description: A school-based substance abuse prevention curriculum for youth ages 11-14 that seeks to influence major social and psychological factors that promote the initiation and early use of substances, targeting youth who have not initiated substance use. The middle school curriculum consists of three major components: 1) Drug Resistance Skills, 2) Personal Self-management Skills, and 3) General Social Skills.

### **SIG Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics): Male and female, predominantly African-American & Hispanic youth, ages 11-14

Setting: A public middle school in an economically depressed area of Flint.

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: Implementation of the Life Skills program was preceded by the Second Step program with the same students. Completion of the program included two full years of involvement, with each student receiving two levels each of Second Step and Life Skills curriculum. Family Series was also included.

## **Satisfaction Assessment Format**

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--” indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	We implemented this program in the past, and have found that the website, emails and phone calls are all useful tools for interacting with the developers.
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>A</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>A</b>	
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	For the first two years, our teams had included heavy coverage by staff with much experience with the program. We sent our two newest people to the Life Skills training this year. These two new staff became the update “experts” and are retraining the rest of our staff.  They had pre/post tests available.
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the training received	<b>A</b>	
Availability of appropriate evaluation instruments and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers’ expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Great....helped us mesh this program with Second Step – the other program that we ran with the same kids.
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>A</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>The biggest issues have concerned coordination with the schools. Things have run smoothly when there has been school administration and teacher cooperation with program staff. At times, internal politics and problems at the middle school have affected attendance at the program..</p> <p>The workbooks are attractive and did not seem expensive.</p> <p>The LS program meshed well with the Second Step program. Any duplication of program topics served as a timely review. For instance, the skill building portions of both programs had similar steps for conflict resolution.</p> <p>This seemed much easier to use than Second Step. The manuals are excellent. Good implementation information. Much, much, much less preparation required, than with Second Step.</p>
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>C</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>C</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>A</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>The attractiveness of the workbooks made the program an easy sell to parents and a simple tool for provider staff. They were easier to adapt to the situation because the program left room for that in the curriculum.</p> <p>Preparation for implementation required much less effort than other universal prevention programs we have implemented. Staff was able to use their time to follow up more closely on attendance, disciplinary action, grades and goals.</p> <p>Staff provided two one hour sessions per week with two staff available. They each prepped approximately one-half hour per session.</p>
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>A</b>	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>A</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>A</b>	
Community receptivity to the program	<b>B</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>Very nice. Relevant to our objectives. Positive feedback from youth.</p>
Overall satisfaction	<b>A</b>	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		

**Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program  
Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:  
LIFE SKILLS TRAINING PROGRAM**

**Provider Name:  
SAGINAW COUNTY YOUTH PROTECTION COUNCIL**

**General Program Background**

Website: [www.lifeskillstraining.com](http://www.lifeskillstraining.com)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): UNIVERSAL

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): MODEL

Program Description: A school-based substance abuse prevention curriculum for youth ages 11-14 that seeks to influence major social and psychological factors that promote the initiation and early use of substances, targeting youth who have not initiated substance use. The middle school curriculum consists of three major components: 1) Drug Resistance Skills, 2) Personal Self-management Skills, and 3) General Social Skills.

**MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics): Male and female, predominantly white youth, ages 11-14

Setting: Middle schools in three small communities outside of Saginaw

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: Implementation has involved all 7<sup>th</sup> & 8<sup>th</sup> graders within each of the school districts and includes the core curriculum as well as booster lessons for subsequent grades.

## Assessment Format

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--” indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	- It was very easy to find out general/overview information about LST to obtain trainings or curriculum.
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>A-</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>B-</b>	
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	- Very easy to obtain information about the frequent trainings.
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	-Training included too much sale of program and not enough experiential learning of curriculum. We were asked for ideas to enhance program but not given ideas. We were told there were supplemental materials being developed but found there would be a cost.  -Pre-post test very lengthy and the excel format sent to us did not come with scoring capabilities. Very expensive.
Quality of the training received	<b>B-</b>	
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>C-</b>	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>C-</b>	-Training was expensive due to travel and lodging costs. 3 people = approximately \$2,269. This does not include some materials we already had and the fact that we saved some cost with lodging.
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	- I believe we could get in contact with the developers fairly easily. However, their responses initially were limited to items they had given us at the training or had online.
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>B+</b>	- Extra activities or information to assist with implementation was not easy to find or user friendly.
Quality of the assistance received	<b>C</b>	



Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>- This was pre-arranged before the grant was submitted. I think it was fairly easy as we had positive relationship with the Intermediate School District and some of the schools involved. Also there was a lot of press on the effectiveness and research of LST to support it.</p> <p>- We had staff already in place and ready to be trained at the beginning of grant and that helped greatly. Schools having different schedules were a challenge.</p> <p>- I think it was fairly easy to implement LST with locations chosen.</p> <p>- For the initial year it cost \$4,328 for the books and teacher manuals, and \$3,774 for the 2<sup>nd</sup> year plus \$1911 for supplemental materials (videos, flip charts, activities).</p>
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>A</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>B</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>B</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>C-</b>	<p>- Needed to make program more interactive and visual for participants to remain interested. This took a lot more prep time and experienced staff to stay within fidelity of the program.</p> <p>- It was difficult to cover and discuss all of the suggested points for some of the lessons.</p> <p>- Staff implementing the program needed to have experience with school-based substance abuse prevention for middle and high school students.</p>
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>C-</b>	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>B-</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>B-</b>	
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>B</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>B-</b>	<p>- The basic concepts of the curriculum are good and universal, but had we known how much work it would take to adapt this program to make it most effective we would not have chosen it.</p> <p>- Higher risk youth needed more adaptations.</p>
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Overall satisfaction	<b>C</b>	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		

**Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of  
Program Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:  
LIFE SKILLS TRAINING PROGRAM**

**Provider Name:  
WEDGWOOD CHRISTIAN SERVICES**

**General Program Background**

Website: [www.lifeskillstraining.com](http://www.lifeskillstraining.com)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): UNIVERSAL

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): MODEL

Program Description: A school-based substance abuse prevention curriculum for youth ages 11-14 that seeks to influence major social and psychological factors that promote the initiation and early use of substances, targeting youth who have not initiated substance use. The middle school curriculum consists of three major components: 1) Drug Resistance Skills, 2) Personal Self-management Skills, and 3) General Social Skills.

**MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics): Racially diverse, male and female youth, ages 12-18

Setting: Urban and suburban, school-based and community-based settings in and around Kent County

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: None

## **Assessment Format**

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--” indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>A</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>A</b>	
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Do not know if they have a tool or if they offer evaluation support. I would assume not only because we have used the curriculum for years and I have never seen an evaluation tool that they have created. However, we create all of our own evaluation tools to assess program effectiveness.  In October of 2003, we paid \$5,000 for a two day Life Skills training on site. We had about 12 people in attendance.
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the training received	<b>A</b>	
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	--	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Attempts have been made to get in contact with trainer over the last couple years. She has never responded.
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>F</b>	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>F</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	We do not use the workbooks. The work books are a resource and not a necessary tool. When the trainer from the developer came, one of the things she worked on with us was bringing the curriculum alive since it can be pretty dry.
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>A</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>A</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>A</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	--	
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Due to the dry nature of the lessons, we need to constantly be aware to monitor the potential drift from modification to changing the program.
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>B</b>	Participant interest is as high as it is due to our agency's skilled facilitators who bring the program alive with experiential learning opportunities.
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>B</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>B</b>	
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>A</b>	Ratio of direct to indirect is 1:3
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	We have had some difficulties providing the full dose of service (17 hours) to the full 900 youth in the population we serve. High Risk youth in inner city and youth in Alternative school settings are apt to be transient and often absent.
Overall satisfaction	<b>A</b>	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		

**Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program  
Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:  
MEDIA SHARP**

**Provider Name:  
WASHTENAW COUNTY PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENT**

**General Program Background**

Website: [www.cdc.gov/tobacco/educational\\_materials/medsrpqa.htm](http://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/educational_materials/medsrpqa.htm)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): UNIVERSAL

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): Not Applicable

Program Description: A substance abuse prevention program for youth ages 11-18 designed to help youth be critical consumers of media messages that relate to alcohol, tobacco and other drugs in advertising, entertainment and news. It seeks to empower young people to make healthier choices by demonstrating the ways that the media glamorize and normalize ATOD use.

**MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics): Racially diverse, male and female youth, ages 12-14

Setting: Schools and community-based settings, student groups (e.g. girl/boy scouts) in Ypsilanti and suburban and rural communities in Washtenaw & Livingston counties

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: Participants were also included in focus groups to gather information used to develop a new media campaign in their schools.

## **Assessment Format**

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--” indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	- We called and talked with representatives of the program as we were considering its implementation. - Information can also be downloaded and printed from the internet. - Some information is a little outdated.
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>A</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>B+</b>	
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	- No formal training is required
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	--	
Quality of the training received	--	
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	--	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	--	
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	--	
Quality of the assistance received	--	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>-The Media Sharp curriculum was modified in both content and time allotted per module in order to implement the curriculum into our target schools on a condensed schedule (i.e., 1 session per week for 5-6 weeks vs. 1 session per week over a 9-16 week period). We followed the modification options the developer provided as a guide in making our changes. Because of time constraints, we chose not to implement curriculum assignments outside of the class time (i.e, no homework was assigned). Additionally, we did not use the 7 minute video because it was out of date</p> <p>- Photocopying is approved by the developers. Our copying costs were significantly reduced because we did not assign homework handouts and much of the work was accomplished through verbal discussion in the classroom. We estimate copying costs at 30¢ per student</p>
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>A</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>A</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>A</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>B</b>	
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>- Due to Media Sharp being a large curriculum in addition to class time constraints, facilitators have adapted the curriculum to fit the situation. (see comments above regarding adaptation)</p> <p>- Interest and involvement varies with different classes based on class size, student interest, staff support.</p> <p>- Front end preparation required a large amount of staff time, but implementation preparation time is minimal.</p>
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>C</b>	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>B</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>B-</b>	
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>--</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>- The program is very repetitive and the video is outdated and therefore we haven't used it. Staff spent time collecting updated relevant supportive media.</p>
Overall satisfaction	<b>B</b>	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		

**Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program  
Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:  
MINNESOTA SMOKING PREVENTION PROGRAM**

**Provider Name:  
PREVENTION WORKS**

**General Program Background**

Website: <http://hazelden.org>

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective and/or indicated): UNIVERSAL

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): Not applicable

Program Description: A smoking prevention curriculum for youth 11-15 years old, based on Social Influence Theory. Helps youth develop refusal/resistance skills and to: 1) identify reasons people start smoking, 2) discover that not smoking is normative behavior, 3) practice skills for resisting pressure to use tobacco, 4) recognize covert messages in tobacco advertising, and 5) determine their own personal reasons for not using tobacco.

**MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics): Male and female, racially diverse youth, ages 12-14

Setting: School and community-based settings in the greater Kalamazoo area

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: None



## Assessment Format

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--” indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ There is very minimal information available about the program. The website only covers superficial elements of the program and doesn't include any research or evaluation tools. It does include a scope and sequence.</li> <li>➤ There is not enough information available for the program. Finding data to support the program is very difficult.</li> </ul>
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>D</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>D</b>	
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ There is not a required training for the program.</li> <li>➤ The evaluation tool created by the developers is a measure of knowledge only. It is very difficult to use when trying to measure perceived risk or behavior change and is also difficult for populations that have a difficult time reading/writing.</li> </ul>
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	--	
Quality of the training received	--	
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>C</b>	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	--	
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Unlike many of the other programs, this program doesn't have as much information on the website. When you have questions you have to call the publisher directly.</li> <li>➤ We have always had a timely response to our questions.</li> </ul>
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>B</b>	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>A-</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ It was very easy to get schools in our county to “catch on” with the program and the participants seemed to really enjoy the lessons.</li> <li>➤ This was an easy program to implement in a typical classroom environment because it is only 6-7 sessions long. The curriculum also contains reproducible handouts for program participants.</li> <li>➤ The program fit very well with our community.</li> <li>➤ The curriculum doesn’t require any additional materials.</li> </ul>
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>A</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>A</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>A</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ This program was very easy to implement with fidelity because the sessions were well-designed and had enough interactive activities to keep the attention of participants.</li> <li>➤ The facilitators and site coordinators for this program are very excited about the program and several long-term collaborations have been created in order to offer the program in subsequent years.</li> <li>➤ The community is also excited about the program. This program isn’t a comprehensive drug prevention program since it only focuses on tobacco. However, it is a very well written curriculum and when facilitated as a piece of a strong prevention component in schools and in the community has shown promise.</li> <li>➤ One facilitator is needed to conduct the program. Each session of MSPP is 45 minutes to one hour in length. It only takes about 1 hour to prepare for sessions. It is a very easy program to implement and doesn't require very much prep time for staff.</li> </ul>
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>A</b>	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>A</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>A</b>	
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>A</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>A</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ This program is really easy to implement and has shown great results in our community. It is an added bonus to be able to copy the handouts and requires minimal materials. The only downfall is the lack of training and evaluation support from the developers. It is an easy program to facilitate even without the training; however additional support is always helpful.</li> <li>➤ This program has worked great in alternative school settings, regular classroom environments and in after-school settings. Incentives and treats encourage active participation and are essential in after-school settings.</li> </ul>
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Overall satisfaction	<b>A-</b>	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		

**Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program  
Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:  
NURSE-FAMILY PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM**

**Provider Name:  
BERRIEN COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT**

**General Program Background**

Website: [www.nccfc.org](http://www.nccfc.org)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): SELECTIVE, INDICATED

CSAP NREPP assessment: MODEL

A comprehensive prevention and education program that provides first-time, low-income mothers with home visitation services from public health nurses. Nurses work intensively with women, focusing on: 1) Pre-natal health (including abstinence from drugs and alcohol), 2) Improved infant care skills to prevent child abuse, neglect and injury, and 3) Preventing risk factors for poverty and poor family functioning in the future (subsequent pregnancy, school dropout, unemployment, welfare dependence).

**MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics): First-time predominantly African-American and white mothers and their infants and families, including fathers, when involved.

Setting: Public health department serving clients in Berrien County, including Benton Harbor and suburban and rural communities in that region.

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: None

## **Assessment Format**

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--” indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Needs in the community were identified and community supported search for NFP program.  Experienced staff at the National Nurse-Family Partnership were available to provide guidance and assistance.
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>B</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>A</b>	
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Nurse home visitors receive more than 60 hours of instruction from the NFP Professional Development team over a 16-month period of time. Training is face-to-face sessions with professional development team.  Training is costly (\$2,500 per nurse - materials \$350) plus cost for travel. Training is required and worth the expense.
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>B</b>	
Quality of the training received	<b>A</b>	
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Implementing agencies receive a variety of services and supports from the program developers (Natl. Center for Children, Families, & Communities). The NCCFC provides initial assistance to sites as they prepare for the program, and helps with program evaluation, assistance with ongoing quality improvement, and help with planning for program expansion as the site matures and develops.
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A+</b>	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>A+</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>Program start up was very time consuming due to the comprehensiveness of the model, the visit schedule, and the overall intensity of the NFP intervention. Case load is limited to 25 clients per nurse home visitor and takes up to 9 months to build case load.</p> <p>All home visitors are registered nurses. With the nursing shortage hiring appropriate staff has been difficult at times.</p> <p>See program training notes regarding costs. The national center estimates administrative costs for four nurses with case are: Office Supplies \$1,200; Program Supplies (\$145.00 per family over 2 1/2 years) \$14,500; Copies of forms \$1,500; Computer and Computer networking fees \$2,210. Our costs have been very close to estimates.</p>
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>B</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>B</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>A</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>The NFP program uses carefully developed guidelines and a strengths-based approach; the visit-by-visit guidelines provide each nurse home visitor with structure and resources to adapt the program to each family's needs. The guidelines also help all the nurses deliver the program consistently and effectively to ensure fidelity to the model.</p>
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>A</b>	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>A</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>A</b>	
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>A</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>Very satisfied with NFP model. Materials are appropriate for enrolled clients. Technical support and evaluation has always been very prompt.</p>
Overall satisfaction	<b>A</b>	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		

## **Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:  
NURTURING PARENTING PROGRAM**

**Provider Name:  
EASTER SEALS – EL CENTRO LA FAMILIA**

### **General Program Background**

Website: [www.nuturingparenting.com](http://www.nuturingparenting.com)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): SELECTIVE

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): PROMISING

Program Description: A prevention program for families with young children who are at risk for child abuse and neglect as well as substance use/abuse. The program is intended to stop the generational cycle of child abuse, reduce juvenile delinquency and alcohol abuse, and reduce teen pregnancy. Parents and children attend separate groups engaging in cognitive and affective activities that build awareness, self-esteem, and empathy. They learn alternatives to yelling and hitting, enhanced family communication patterns, and expectations for children that are realistic in terms of their stage of development.

### **MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics): Young Hispanic/Latino mothers and fathers, with young children.

Setting: Pontiac/Metro Detroit

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: Attempts have been made to recruit fathers for their own abbreviated Nurturing Parenting training program with limited success

## **Assessment Format**

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--” indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Information is easy to find in website and it is useful. Also, workbooks are very easy to follow.
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>A</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>A</b>	Materials contain information relevant to age of participants.
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Developer is easy to access. We helped translate some of the materials for him and in turn he gave us free copies.
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the training received	<b>B</b>	
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>C</b>	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>B</b>	The program does not provide a tool that can measure client's growth and we have been looking for something appropriate.
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Technical assistance is available. The few times we have consulted him it has been satisfactory.
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>B</b>	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>B</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>We get referrals easily and sometimes may have to turn people away. However, it is more difficult to recruit volunteers to work on the groups because of the long-term commitment.</p> <p>Staff is needed at a 2:1 ratio for the younger children. Space can be a challenge when the number of children is high. Ideally, we need a room for the toddlers, another one for the infants and a larger one for the mother's groups.</p> <p>Materials are expensive but they are well done and can be reused. They have workbooks for parents of children of different age groups, for adolescent parents and father's groups. Also, they are written with different age groups in mind. The full set costs \$ 1,800.</p>
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>B</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>C</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>A</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>C</b>	
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>Fidelity is easy to maintain as program is well structured.</p> <p>Staff gets encouraged by the growth they see in their clients even though providing weekly sessions can be very challenging. Staff works with parents in one room while other staff works with children in another room and then they get together to practice what they have learned. Staff says, "It is a lot of work but it is worth it". It has been well received and other agencies are using it too.</p> <p>Retention has been high for both participants and volunteers, most participants complete the 23 weeks, which speaks for the satisfaction with program implementation. Participants, who come on a voluntary basis, have expressed satisfaction.</p> <p>While implementation requires considerable volunteers and staff time, it is worth the efforts. Staff is able to identify areas of participant's growth and self-confidence. They can also see the effects in the parent-child relationships.</p> <p>Sessions are 2 1/2 hours of direct staff time and they meet an hour before for planning and preparation of materials and half an hour after the group for debriefing and feedback.</p>
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>A</b>	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>A</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>A</b>	
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>B</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Overall satisfaction	<b>A</b>	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		



## **Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:  
PARENTING WISELY**

**Provider Name:  
THE CENTER FOR HUMAN RESOURCES**

### **General Program Background**

Website: [www.parentingwisely.com](http://www.parentingwisely.com)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): SELECTIVE, INDICATED

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): MODEL

Program Description: An interactive curriculum delivered by CD-ROM for parents of delinquent and at-risk youth, ages 9-18. The program teaches 1) Communication, 2) Assertive discipline, and 3) Supervision. Nine hypothetical scenarios present common parenting challenges, and allow parents to react and see outcomes of their choices, parents answer questions about ideas and skills presented.

### **MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics): Parents already receiving substance abuse/mental health services through the provider agency

Setting: Implemented within a clinical service context

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: Recruitment of parents to participate in the program has been difficult without an identified referral source.

## **Assessment Format**

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--” indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>A</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>A</b>	
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	The training for this program was quick, clear and easy to manipulate on the computer.  The cost of the training materials was appropriate for the training provided.
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the training received	<b>A</b>	
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	When contacted for assistance the representatives were very helpful in clarifying any issues or referred me to those individuals who could assist me properly.
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>A</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	We learned very quickly that this program used as a clinical tool in our agency was not being implemented like we had planned. The clinicians reported that the focus of what they work with, relative to their consumers, is severe substance dependency problems. The Parenting Wisely Program was not being introduced as a treatment option with our consumers. However, The Parenting Wisely Program appears to be easily adaptable to fit the needs of individuals who are in need of additional parenting skills. (Our agency had one client who was serviced through this program and reported that it was "helpful").
Ease of recruiting participants	--	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	--	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	--	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	--	
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	A	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	A	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	B	
Community enthusiasm for the program	B	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	B	Not comfortable with rating due to lack of implementing program. It is possible that we as an agency needed to investigate the clinical needs of our consumers and review the existing parenting prevention program, already being implemented, more carefully. The issue it appears is two fold in that we as an agency were planning on implementing this program with the existing clinical clientele. However, this agency's consumer needs and focus of treatment is mainly for substance abuse/dependency issues. The teaching of parenting skills was not a priority for most of the clinicians. Moreover, it could have been useful for us to discuss more clearly with the clinicians their lack of implementing this program and how treatment plans could have integrated Parenting Wisely with their consumers (I did address this issue but received no feedback). Also, we as an agency implement the STEP Program, which is based on a different approach/style to teaching parenting skills in comparison to the Parenting Wisely Program. It was reported that it was a "conflict" teaching two approaches to parents
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Overall satisfaction	--	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		

**Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program  
Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:  
PARENTING WISELY**

**Provider Name:  
COPPER COUNTRY COALITION FOR A DRUG FREE COMMUNITY**

**General Program Background**

Website: [www.parentingwisely.com](http://www.parentingwisely.com)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): SELECTIVE, INDICATED

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): MODEL

Program Description: An interactive curriculum delivered by CD-ROM for parents of delinquent and at-risk youth, ages 9-18. The program teaches 1) Communication, 2) Assertive discipline, and 3) Supervision. Nine hypothetical scenarios present common parenting challenges, and allow parents to react and see outcomes of their choices, parents answer questions about ideas and skills presented.

**MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics): Predominantly white parents in four counties in the Western Upper Peninsula of Michigan.

Setting: Rural

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: None

## **Assessment Format**

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--“ indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Information was found on the SAMHSA website.
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>A</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>A</b>	
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	No training was required for this program.
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	--	
Quality of the training received	--	
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	--	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	--	
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Program developers were available to answer implementation questions when they arose. They provided technical assistance when we had questions,( i.e. how many of the scenarios would be appropriate for single parents), and for technology glitches. The program has recently been revised. We were given a complementary copy of the new program (since we bought the program only six weeks or so before the new one was available), and asked to give feedback regarding technology glitches.
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>A</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>Recruitment appeared to be relatively easy, but the parents that would have experienced the greatest benefit were the least likely to utilize the program unless very strongly advised by the courts.</p> <p>Staff has been willing to accommodate difficult client schedules with week end and evening hours with little/no change in program utilization.</p> <p>Materials include CDs and parent workbooks and the cost is \$659.</p>
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>A</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>A</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>A</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>The participant navigates the program with interest and ease. The greater challenge is often fitting into the participant's schedule.</p> <p>Staff time includes developing PR materials; providing presentations about the program at collaborative meetings and agency/organization staff meetings; scheduling PW sessions (up to three, two-hour sessions). Staff time is about .10 FTE. Time goes into providing the program with parents, PR (brochures, press releases, etc.) demonstrating it at meeting, etc.</p>
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>A</b>	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>A</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>A</b>	
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>C</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>B</b>	
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>This program can be used for a variety of parents experiencing problems/concerns with their teenagers. It can also be done in a variety of settings, i.e. office, church, school, home, etc. We have also found parents self-refer into other traditional parenting programs after the PW program.</p>
Overall satisfaction	<b>A</b>	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		

**Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program  
Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:  
PROJECT ALERT**

**Provider Name:  
ARAB-AMERICAN CHALDEAN COUNCIL**

**General Program Background**

Website: [www.projectalert.best.org](http://www.projectalert.best.org)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): UNIVERSAL, SELECTIVE

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): MODEL

Program Description: A school-based, substance abuse prevention curriculum for middle school students 11-14 years old. Project Alert uses participatory activities and videos to: Motivate adolescents against drug use, teach adolescents the skills and strategies needed to resist pro-drug messages, establish non-drug-using norms.

**MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics): Male and female, predominantly African-American & Arab-American/Chaldean middle school youth, ages 11-14

Setting: Socio-economically stressed region of Detroit, and nearby regions where the target Arab/Chaldean population resides

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: None

## Assessment Format

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--” indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	The Project Alert website is very informative. It provides a breakdown of the lessons and provides links to research that has been done on the program.
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>A</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>A</b>	
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	The training for Project Alert can all be done online which is very convenient. Also the training does not have to be completed all at once. You can go on and complete a portion of the training whenever your schedule permits. Also the training is included in the cost of the curriculum, which is nice. Staff felt that the online training was very beneficial and informative. It took you through each of the lessons and offered tips on how to implement the lesson effectively. It also provided examples of how to make the program more interesting for the participants.
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the training received	<b>A</b>	
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	The Project Alert staff has been very helpful whenever we have had a question about the program. Their website provides both phone and email contact information and a place to email them with questions that you might have in a number of different areas.
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>A</b>	



Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>Recruiting participants for the program was not difficult. School administrators felt that the program would be very beneficial for their students and were eager to have the program implemented.</p> <p>This program is very user friendly. The lessons are broken down for you and tell you what materials you will need. The curriculum was easily adaptable for use with our target population. Staff was able to collect all the materials necessary for the program and had sufficient time to prepare for each of the lessons. The program materials provided, especially the videos, were very valuable. Program staff feels that they provide the students with great examples of resistance skills and help reinforce the lesson topics.</p> <p>Curriculum materials were already purchased from the previous year. No additional costs were incurred.</p>
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>B</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>A</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>A</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>With Project Alert it is easy to maintain program fidelity. Both the staff that was implementing the program and the students that were participating in it were enthusiastic. This program gives the students many opportunities to participate in the lessons through role-playing activities. Staff feels that these activities are really important because they allow the students to take ownership of the lessons they are learning and allow them to practice their newly acquired skills. The school administration in the school where this program is implemented is very happy with the program. Staff feels that this is a very valuable program.</p> <p>The staffing requirements are one staff per class.</p>
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>A</b>	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>B</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>B</b>	
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>A</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>Overall we have been very happy with this program. It provides the students with skills that they greatly need and also gives them the chance to practice these skills.</p>
Overall satisfaction	<b>A</b>	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		

**Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program  
Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:  
PROJECT ALERT**

**Provider Name:  
THE CENTER FOR HUMAN RESOURCES**

**General Program Background**

Website: [www.projectalert.best.org](http://www.projectalert.best.org)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): UNIVERSAL, SELECTIVE

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): MODEL

Program Description: A school-based, substance abuse prevention curriculum for middle school students 11-14 years old. Project Alert uses participatory activities and videos to: Motivate adolescents against drug use, teach adolescents the skills and strategies needed to resist pro-drug messages, establish non-drug-using norms.

**MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics): Male and female, predominantly white youth, ages 12-14

Setting: Public and private middle schools in Port Huron and small communities in the region.

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: None

## **Assessment Format**

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--” indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>A</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>A</b>	
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	The On-Line training was an efficient way to complete the training process. In addition, the training was self explanatory and self directed.  The program cost was appropriate for the training provided.
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the training received	<b>A</b>	
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Any technical assistance that has been needed has been handled in an efficient manner.
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>A</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	The logistics involved with the implementation process of this program went smoothly. We had existing staff to implement the program in each of the school settings. These two prevention specialists completed the required training and reported no difficulties with delivering this program with fidelity.
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>B</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>A</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>A</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Both prevention specialists who implement this program report being prepared for delivery, and being comfortable and enthusiastic due to the response from the middle school students who continue to receive this program. In addition, we have received positive reports from the school staff and students about the delivery of this program. Students' reports to the specialists state they enjoy the classroom participation and the games involved with this program. Teachers reported that they like the organized manner in which the material is delivered (i.e. the videos and activities).
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>A</b>	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>A</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>A</b>	
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>B</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Overall satisfaction	<b>A</b>	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		

**Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program  
Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:  
PROJECT ALERT**

**Provider Name:  
WARREN-CONNER DEVELOPMENT COALITION**

**General Program Background**

Website: [www.projectalert.best.org](http://www.projectalert.best.org)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): UNIVERSAL, SELECTIVE

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): MODEL

Program Description: A school-based, substance abuse prevention curriculum for middle school students 11-14 years old. Project Alert uses participatory activities and videos to: Motivate adolescents against drug use, teach adolescents the skills and strategies needed to resist pro-drug messages, establish non-drug-using norms.

**MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics):  
African-American middle school students

Setting: A middle school in an economically depressed area of Detroit

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: Project Alert is being implemented as one element of an innovative after school youth enhancement program called Youth on the Edge...of Greatness, Inc. This program was designed by the agency and area residents and has operated for over 20 years, providing academic support, cultural enrichment, and work readiness, involving parents, families and school staff.

## Assessment Format

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--” indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Project Alert was already a curriculum we were familiar with because we were using an earlier version in our after school program at another school. When choosing a curriculum for the SIG grant we decided to use Project Alert again. We visited the website which offered online training at a reasonable price.  Information about Project ALERT is available at <a href="http://www.projectalert.com">www.projectalert.com</a> .
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>A</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>A</b>	
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	The entire Project ALERT program is \$150 per educator.  Teacher training is delivered online. Or, if your group is large enough, they provide an on-site traditional workshop at no extra charge.  The following materials are provided to every educator who registers for Project ALERT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to online teacher training</li> <li>• Fourteen lesson plans</li> <li>• Eight interactive student videos in DVD or VHS format</li> <li>• Toll-free phone support and technical assistance</li> <li>• Unlimited online access to curriculum resources and refresher training</li> <li>• An authorization “E-code” that can be shared with colleagues to create additional free training accounts</li> <li>• Twelve full-color classroom posters to support learning goals and reinforce visual learners.</li> </ul>
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the training received	<b>A</b>	
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers’ expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Project ALERT offers toll-free phone support and technical assistance.
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>A</b>	
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>Because the middle school that our after-school program operates in houses an overwhelming number of students who are bused, recruiting is very difficult. Most students are unable to walk home and most do not have another mode of transportation to get home.</p> <p>The program was relatively easy to run after each staff person was trained and certified.</p> <p>The program elements fit perfectly in the environment of the population we serve. The difficult part is getting the word out that the program exists.</p> <p>As described above, the entire Project ALERT program is \$150 per educator.</p>
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>C</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>B</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>C</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>Once the youth are in the program they definitely learn valuable lessons from Project ALERT, the difficult part is convincing the community about the value of the program. Program staff members are enthused about the curriculum because it is proven to work and step-by-step instructions are included. Lesson plans are scripted and are outfitted with videos/DVDs and posters.</p> <p>Youth respond well to the curriculum because it is very interactive. Students are often asked to participate in skits and things of that nature.</p>
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>A</b>	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>A</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>B</b>	
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>C</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>B</b>	<p>Overall the Project ALERT curriculum is great. Anyone interested in teaching the curriculum should become familiar with other types of drugs as well because youth often have questions about them. Our biggest challenge is getting the school to see the relevance of the program. Everyone that takes the time to learn about the program is instantly on board. As long as a great partnership exists there should be no problems recruiting and retaining youth.</p>
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Overall satisfaction	<b>B</b>	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		

**Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program  
Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:  
PROJECT SUCCESS**

**Provider Name:  
BAY AREA SOCIAL INTERVENTION SERVICES (BASIS), INC.**

**General Program Background**

Website: [www.sascorp.org](http://www.sascorp.org)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): SELECTIVE, INDICATED

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): MODEL

Program Description: Modeled on student assistance programs, SUCCESS places highly trained counselors in alternative high schools to provide a full range of substance use prevention and early intervention services to youth ages 14-18 years old. The program includes a prevention education series, individual assessment, individual and group counseling, parent programs, and problem identification and referral.

**MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics): Male and female, racially diverse youth, ages 12-20

Setting: Two alternative high schools in the greater Bay City area

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: None



## Assessment Format

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--” indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Manuals were set up well and are user friendly. Prevention Education information was very detailed & precise. Counseling Group information had to be developed further by individual interventionist.
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>A-</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>B-</b>	
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Initial training was excellent. Trainer was very familiar with program implementation and flow.  Evaluation tools were made available by trainer. For second implementation year, developer was contacted for suggestions and further detail on evaluation options which they provided.  Cost before reductions: \$4,125. We were able to offset cost by advertising training to others. Four participants from other areas paid a fee to attend thereby reducing our cost and increasing value.
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A-</b>	
Quality of the training received	<b>A-</b>	
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>B+</b>	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>B+</b>	
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Everyone involved with implementation is/was very pleased with ease and quality of support by phone and/or e-mail, prompt response from developer.
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A-</b>	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>A-</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>There was some interpretation needed and some application challenges as the two manuals were set up for different school settings (ie; traditional vs. alternative).</p> <p>Difficulties encountered tended to be related to adapting to the scheduling and space particulars of each site. Teachers and other personnel were reluctant to release students from classes and other activities until the Project Success counselors and the program became better known</p> <p>Reproducible materials included with training costs. \$3483 was spent on supplies in the first quarter of implementation which works out to an estimated \$40 per participant in that first quarter, however, some of these costs would have covered supplies used well beyond the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter and were sometimes for items that were start-up related. Therefore, the per participant cost for materials required for presentation was most likely much less than \$40 per participant and was a good value.</p>
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>B</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>B</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>B</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>B</b>	<p>Varying degree of interest/success between sites with regard to parent component involvement.</p> <p>School “community” reports that having the program was initially a luxury, but has become a necessity because of the integral support the program provides students and staff.</p> <p>Community professionals have increasingly partnered with program counselors to assist students &amp; families through prevention/intervention programming.</p> <p>In some instances the support made possible by this programming has literally saved lives which makes it invaluable.</p> <p>The program implementation in our community has required two full time counselors, one in each school, and one pt “director” who handles some evaluation work.</p>
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>B</b>	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>A</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>A-</b>	
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>A-</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>A</b>	<p>Appears to implement more successfully in charter school setting where there is more flexibility and direct student involvement on the part of school personnel. The charter alternative school has more scheduling leeway than the public school and students are more likely to be involved with after school programming. The public school students must leave the grounds after school. The charter school uses a consensus system for decision making and uses a conflict resolution system to deal with problems between students and teachers, teachers and other teachers, admin. and teachers, etc. It appears that all staff at the charter school are devoted to holistically dealing with students and their many issues and are therefore very cooperative and team-oriented when it comes to counselor activities. The same level of cooperation and team work was not experienced in the public school program.</p>
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Overall satisfaction	<b>B+</b>	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		

**Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program  
Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:  
PROJECT SUCCESS**

**Provider Name:  
THE CENTER FOR HUMAN RESOURCES**

**General Program Background**

Website: [www.sascorp.org](http://www.sascorp.org)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): SELECTIVE, INDICATED

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): MODEL

Program Description: Modeled on student assistance programs, SUCCESS places a highly trained counselors in alternative high schools to provide a full range of substance use prevention and early intervention services to youth ages 14-18 years old. The program includes a prevention education series, individual assessment, individual and group counseling, parent programs, and problem identification and referral.

**MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics): Male and female, predominantly white youth, ages 14-18 years

Setting: Two alternative high schools in two different school districts within St. Clair County

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: None

## **Assessment Format**

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--” indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>A</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>A</b>	
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>The training for this program consisted of a three day training session that was conveniently located. This program training was very useful and detailed and the trainer was very clear, personable and approachable.</p> <p>The cost of this three day training was appropriate considering the all-day training and two night stay. The cost of the training was \$340 per person plus lodging. This cost varies depending on where you travel to receive the training. The key is to plan ahead and receive the training nearest to your agency.</p>
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the training received	<b>A</b>	
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>I have called to clarify issues regarding the implementation of this program during the last two years. At all times I have been connected with individuals who have been able to answer questions and/or appoint someone who could.</p>
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>A</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>The process for the start-up phase for both alternative high schools went smoothly. The first and only “chain of command” was meeting with the school principals and then they had to receive the OK from their “chain of command”. We did have difficulty initially with the principal at our second location. He was not willing to take the steps necessary to get the OK to go ahead from his “chain of command”. But, that principal left and it was then that we were able to make progress in that location. Once we were notified that we had the OK from the principals the process of setting up the program began.</p> <p>We discovered (and maybe fortunate) that both principals were anxious for the additional support for the students and were very accommodating to our needs. They immediately provided us with our room to deliver this program and the program began.</p>
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>A</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>A</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>A</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	<p>The delivery method is simple to implement and to understand the process of the groups. The training process provided the staff implementer with the knowledge needed to learn the material and deliver it with enthusiasm. It has never been a difficult process to learn the program and to implement the material. It would be best if the individual implementing this program has a Masters in Counseling, Psychology, or Social Work and experience with higher risk adolescents and group work is a must.</p> <p>The topics covered in the intervention and prevention groups are interesting and well accepted by the students. This program is being well received through the school district as a needed support for the alternative high school.</p> <p>The majority of time spent with this program is direct contact with students. The prep time for the group work is minimal once the foundation of materials has been learned through the planned curriculum.</p>
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>A</b>	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>A</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>B</b>	
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>A</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>A</b>	<p>It is evident that this program design is a fit for an alternative high school.</p>
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Overall satisfaction	<b>A</b>	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		

**Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program  
Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:  
PROJECT TOWARD NO DRUG ABUSE**

**Provider Name:  
SUBSTANCE ABUSE COUNCIL OF GREATER BATTLE CREEK**

**General Program Background**

Website: <http://www.cceanet.org/Research/Sussman/tnd.htm>

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): SELECTIVE, INDICATED

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): MODEL

Program Description: A substance abuse prevention curriculum targeting youth 14-19 years old. A highly interactive, school-based program with lessons that include group discussions, games, role-playing exercises, videos, and worksheets. Can be used in regular and alternative high schools.

**MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics): Implemented with racially diverse youth ages 14-19 in greater Battle Creek.

Setting: Alternative High school, residential juvenile home, inner city high school, and community-based settings.

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: Implementation of the program took place for 12 sessions in a six-week period. Some groups met twice a week for six weeks instead of once a week for twelve weeks.

## Assessment Format

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--” indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	It was very easy finding information on PTNDA on-line and on SAMHSA's website as it is a model program.
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>A</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>B-</b>	The information available did not indicate that this program was originally tested with very high risk inner city students in LA. It was not until we began training that this was revealed.
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Trainer was able to accommodate our training schedule. We received permission to train others after we were trained.
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the training received	<b>C</b>	Trainer lacked enthusiasm and was not able to answer all participant questions.
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>--</b>	Pre and Post survey are part of the program, but we did not use them for this implementation.
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	Trainer costs, including flight and hotel expenses, were about \$3,200. For that amount, we were able to train 20 people.
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	When trying to reach people for technical assistance, they never answered the phone, but did get back to us the next day. They were very pleasant and agreeable to our concerns and prospective changes but they never put in writing any of their phone comments or their verbal permission to change aspects of the program.
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>B</b>	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>C-</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>Preparation was easy because our area high schools were receptive to the program (they did not offer other substance abuse education programs), and we had a large number of school and community people attend our training at no cost to us with the promise that they would teach the program.</p> <p>We had verbal permission to make changes and adaptations and the program did fit in with many of our high risk populations.</p> <p>Many pages of the workbooks aren't needed to present the lessons nor are they valued by the students. We found books in trash cans upon completion of the program. Some pages as handouts or rewritten on note cards would be fine. For example, when assigning roles for the talk show or the marijuana panel, it is easier to have the roles on note cards rather than reading from the book.</p>
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>A</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>A</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>B</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>C</b>	<p>Our staff brought enthusiasm to the program. Some of the sessions need to be more interactive and we were able to accommodate that. For example, the lesson on smoking involved a basketball game but only in the sense that the two teams answered questions for 1 to 3 points. We added shooting a Nerf ball into a hoop for extra points if they were able to answer the content question correctly.</p> <p>The program has many relevant and valuable lessons.</p>
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>B</b>	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>A</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>B</b>	
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>A</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Spend more time inquiring about target audience, and watching program being implemented.
Overall satisfaction	<b>A-</b>	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		



**Washtenaw County  
Reality Check Youth Media Campaign  
Program Development and Implementation Experiences**

Washtenaw County Public Health Department, in partnership with Livingston County Community Alliance, developed a web based substance abuse prevention media campaign for youth ages 12-14 called Reality Check.

The website, [www.myrealitycheck.org](http://www.myrealitycheck.org) offers middle school youth in 7 target schools an opportunity to learn about ATOD in a fun, engaging and interactive way.

In developing the campaign, we turned to similar campaigns such as the Truth Campaign for direction in targeting youth. We also consulted the social marketing literature and we relied heavily on a contract marketing firm for guidance on media campaign development and dissemination strategies.

As with any campaign development, we did experience difficulties as we began to look at the cost of creating a website and supplemental materials. Our greatest challenge was working within a small budget compared to budgets of the national prevention campaigns. This challenge required us to be creative and targeted in our approach as we launched our campaign. Paid radio/TV spots are out the question, so we turned to our target schools and their varied approaches to getting messages to their students and families. These approaches included: school marquee, in school TV and PA announcements, inserting our materials into their newsletters and mailings as well as direct approaches like in school Reality Check giveaways.

Our recommendation for other groups considering this type of prevention activity include:

1. Build on existing relationships with schools and community groups.
2. The prevention message must be equally stimulating and eye-catching to compete with the barrage of other media messages targeted at youth.
3. Website development is time consuming, it is important to have access to or staff on hand who can write text for this target group in order to keep it fresh and engaging.
4. Wearable items should be tested with youth prior to ordering. We discovered that youth wear a much smaller size in t-shirts and sweatshirts than we thought.
5. Youth involvement is critical to the success of this project.

**Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program  
Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:  
RECONNECTING YOUTH**

**Provider Name:  
COMMUNITY ASSESSMENT REFERRAL & EDUCATION (CARE) OF MACOMB**

**General Program Background**

Website: [www.son.washington.edu/departments/pch/ry](http://www.son.washington.edu/departments/pch/ry)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): INDICATED

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): MODEL

Program Description: A school-based substance abuse prevention program targeting high school students, 14-18 years old, who are at risk for dropping out of school, and may exhibit multiple problem behaviors such as substance abuse, aggression, depression, and suicide risk behaviors. The program involves peers, school personnel and parents to address the three central program goals: 1) Decreased drug involvement, 2) Increased school performance, and 3) Decreased emotional distress.

**MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics): Male and female, predominantly white youth, ages 12-17

Setting: Four regular and alternative middle and high schools in Macomb County

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: None

## Assessment Format

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--” indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes																								
PROGRAM SELECTION	Rating	Reconnecting Youth/Leona L. Eggert and Liela J. Nicholas www.nesonline.com: National Educational Service FAX: (812) 336-7790 (812) 336-7700																								
Ease of finding information about the program	A																									
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	A																									
PROGRAM TRAINING	Rating	Training was very well organized and trainers were very knowledgeable. However, the training was costly and limited to 8-10 participants, which limited our ability to train additional staff for future use. There are no local trainers, so the cost was higher due to airfare, car rental and hotel accommodations. The training is four full days. This was a barrier for school personnel and their release time. Additional money was spent on Substitute Teachers.																								
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	B																									
Quality of the training received	A																									
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	A																									
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	C	<b>Estimate for four-day RY Training</b> <table><tr><td>▪ Trainer Fee \$750.00 per day x 4 days</td><td>\$3000.00</td></tr><tr><td>▪ Air Travel Round Trip</td><td>\$600.00</td></tr><tr><td>▪ Car Rental</td><td>\$225.00</td></tr><tr><td>▪ Per Diem \$35.00 per day x 5 days</td><td>\$175.00</td></tr><tr><td>▪ Airport parking</td><td>\$75.00</td></tr><tr><td>▪ Hotel Accommodations</td><td>\$254.00</td></tr><tr><td>▪ Breakfast/Lunch for trainings x4 days</td><td>\$250.00</td></tr><tr><td>▪ Training manual</td><td>\$1600.00</td></tr><tr><td>▪ Misc. supplies</td><td>\$150.00</td></tr><tr><td>▪ Salaries \$150.00 per day x 4 days</td><td>\$4800.00</td></tr><tr><td>▪ RY Curriculum</td><td>\$2400.00</td></tr><tr><td>TOTAL</td><td>\$13,529.00</td></tr></table>	▪ Trainer Fee \$750.00 per day x 4 days	\$3000.00	▪ Air Travel Round Trip	\$600.00	▪ Car Rental	\$225.00	▪ Per Diem \$35.00 per day x 5 days	\$175.00	▪ Airport parking	\$75.00	▪ Hotel Accommodations	\$254.00	▪ Breakfast/Lunch for trainings x4 days	\$250.00	▪ Training manual	\$1600.00	▪ Misc. supplies	\$150.00	▪ Salaries \$150.00 per day x 4 days	\$4800.00	▪ RY Curriculum	\$2400.00	TOTAL	\$13,529.00
▪ Trainer Fee \$750.00 per day x 4 days	\$3000.00																									
▪ Air Travel Round Trip	\$600.00																									
▪ Car Rental	\$225.00																									
▪ Per Diem \$35.00 per day x 5 days	\$175.00																									
▪ Airport parking	\$75.00																									
▪ Hotel Accommodations	\$254.00																									
▪ Breakfast/Lunch for trainings x4 days	\$250.00																									
▪ Training manual	\$1600.00																									
▪ Misc. supplies	\$150.00																									
▪ Salaries \$150.00 per day x 4 days	\$4800.00																									
▪ RY Curriculum	\$2400.00																									
TOTAL	\$13,529.00																									

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	The developer did not communicate by e-mail at the time. If you wanted to speak to the developer, you had to leave a message and she would return your call. This of course led to a number of “phone tag” situations.
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>B</b>	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>B</b>	
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Cooperation and building relationships with building Principals, Counselors and Teachers is critical. Student selection and following the recommended criteria is also important to program success. The students must feel they are invited to the program and not forced into the class. Classroom availability was an issue. It was difficult to find space to hold the class on a daily basis. Often the class had to share a classroom with a teacher with limited space and inability to post program information. The curriculum itself was priced adequately. The Workbooks are very expensive. The program also requires “incentives” to help with implementation (stickers, journals, prizes, etc.)
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>B</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>B</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>B</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>B</b>	
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	It was necessary to use “Booster” activities to maintain student interest. Student “buy-in” is critical. It is important that the students “choose” to participate in the class, rather than be forced to take the class. Teachers were not always enthusiastic about the program. Often they were unwilling to submit progress reports when asked. It’s important that the teachers understand and support program goals and objectives. RY teachers were not paid for indirect hours. This program requires an extensive amount of “prep” time on a daily basis.
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>B</b>	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>A</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>A</b>	
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>B</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>B</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
LESSONS LEARNED	Rating	<p>It is important to remain diligent when grouping high risk youth together. The RY Teacher must develop a supportive peer group without allowing the students to glamorize their negative perceptions. Because of the small class size and the intense time the students have together, friendships form. Within the safety of the RY class this is positive. When these friendships continue outside the structure of the class, the students may drift back to disconnecting from school and return to negative peer influences. We have taken many steps to avoid this negative backlash, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Student selection: students are interviewed and fill out an application. They are asked to rank themselves in terms of “change readiness.” Those with high readiness were then chosen by the counseling staff. They divide the students by age, race and risk factors to form a diverse group. This has shown to be beneficial so far.</li><li>• Students have been invited to join positive alternative activities and participate in these programs.</li><li>• Met with school personnel to describe the program and encourage their participation. In order for students to feel successful and connected to school, they need recognition from other teachers. We also need their support to fill out progress reports for the RY Teacher.</li><li>• Fieldtrips have been designed to help build leadership skills and increase their knowledge of ATOD risks.</li></ul> <p>It’s also necessary to have administrative support when working within the school systems.</p>
Overall satisfaction	B	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		

## **Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:  
SECOND STEP**

**Provider Name:  
CONNEXION, INC.**

### **General Program Background**

Website: [www.cfchildren.org](http://www.cfchildren.org)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): UNIVERSAL

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): MODEL

Program Description: A violence prevention curriculum for children ages 4-14 designed to reduce impulsive, high-risk, and aggressive behaviors and increase children's social-emotional competence and other protective factors. Second Step is classroom-based, and lesson content varies by grade but is organized around three main themes: 1) Empathy, 2) Impulse Control and Problem Solving, and 3) Anger Management.

### **MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics): Male and female, predominantly African-American & Hispanic youth, ages 11-14

Setting: A public middle school in an economically depressed area of Flint.

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: The implementation of Second Step was immediately followed with Life Skills Training Program with the same students. Completion of the program included two full years of involvement, with each student receiving two levels each of Second Step and Life Skills curriculum. Family Series was also included.

## **Assessment Format**

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--“ indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Great informational website. Excellent help regarding implementation and fidelity issues. Helpful in generating productive dialogue with PIRE/SIG and Connexion. Parents could be easily referred to site and developer for further information.
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>A</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>A</b>	
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Initially, three out of four regular instructors had Second Step training and experience. When staffing changed, we trained one person as a train-the-trainer, who then trained new staff and retrained existing staff. In this way we received most bang-for-our-buck. This trainer remains an advisor to the program. All staff are now qualified to substitute for each other at any level. Training was three days and required air travel, three nights lodging, meals, and training fees, plus salary for the person(s) to cover the trainee's normal duties. Fees available on website. The trainer and training were excellent.
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the training received	<b>A</b>	
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>B</b>	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Received prompt responses to all types of communication we initiated. They also have Committee for Children quarterly email updates on tricks and techniques. We received invaluable support in trying to adapt the SS Parent Program to parents of our age group, and to gain SIG approval of the concept.
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>A</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>Recruiting participants and setting up logistics was difficult in our case, because we had initially intended to implement the program with a selective/indicated population. We might not have faced these difficulties had we planned a universal implementation from the beginning.</p> <p>Across the years, the biggest issues have concerned coordination with the schools. Things have run smoothly when there has been school administration and teacher cooperation with program staff. At times, internal politics and problems at the middle school have affected attendance at the program.</p> <p><u>Materials:</u> We had some manuals already on site. We updated as necessary. They were difficult to copy and to run materials because the originals were very heavy card stock and required someone to feed each side of each page through the copier. This required a good deal of staff time. We would have preferred a workbook. Videos were relevant to subject matter and well done, but references to certain things were outdated and not always culturally relevant to youth we served. We updated by having our students produce their own videos and power points.</p>
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>D</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>D</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>C</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>C</b>	<p>Implementation guidelines, comprehensive teachers' manual, and session extensions are strong points. We had to extend the initial portion of the program just to gain trust and an openness to some new ideas. <u>Provider staff</u> were satisfied with the actual program materials. <u>Participants:</u> most were very appreciative of being heard, doing the role plays and trying out new skills. The few who struggled in our classes, were struggling elsewhere in the school, as well. The content language was very difficult for our population. <u>Value:</u> Easy preparation, but very time consuming. The way the middle school had schedules made it very difficult to schedule youth to meet twice a week. This required double staffing each session, just to round up the students, deal with reluctant teachers releasing them, ensuring our program was not used to play "hookey", etc... We also had many low functioning students who required one-on-one instruction in order to do the assignments or to have the content translated into Spanish. Each group met 25 or more times to finish Second Step. We averaged two staff per hour of programming (2 hours) and about one-half hour prep for each staff (1 hour) per each class period, if all classes stayed at the same level. However, assemblies, fire drills, etc..., made the content stagger and the preparation time increase.</p>
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>B</b>	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>B</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>B</b>	
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>B</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>C</b>	



Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
LESSONS LEARNED	Rating	This program would be best done by entering an existing Health Class, or the like, two times per week. Incentives to school attendance, grades, homework and disciplinary actions helped. We had to have instructors of varied ages, ethnicities, bilingual abilities, gender, etc. to make this relevant. We added “office times” for the youth to gain our support outside of programming. We attended school functions on and off campus and took pictures to share with students and teachers to “earn” acceptance as outsiders.
Overall satisfaction	B+	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		

**Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of  
Program Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:**  
***STAY SMART & SMART LEADERS* components of SMART MOVES**

**Provider Name:**  
**THE BOYS AND GIRLS CLUB OF BAY MILLS**

**General Program Background**

Website: [www.bgca.org](http://www.bgca.org)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): Universal

Program Description: Both programs are components of Boys & Girls Clubs of America's SMART Moves program. Stay SMART is a prevention curriculum for youth, ages 13-15 that stresses abstinence from drugs and sexual activity. SMART Leaders is a 2-year booster program for youth, 14-17 years old, who have completed Stay SMART. It reinforces the substance abuse prevention skills and knowledge of the first program, with sessions on self-concept, coping with stress, and resisting media pressures. As participants advance in the program, they may have the opportunity to act as drug-free peer leaders.

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): SMART Leaders rated EFFECTIVE

**MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics): Male and female, predominantly Native American youth, ages 12-17

Setting: Charter school and summer teen employment program at the Boys & Girls Club in the Bay Mills area of the Eastern Upper Peninsula

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: None

## **Assessment Format**

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--” indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>A</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>A</b>	
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	The training really didn't consist of training on the material and how to present it. It was mostly training on ice-breakers and getting to know participants in the trainings. Our staff member felt that she didn't benefit from the trainings as much as she hoped. Although the icebreakers were great to get to know people and would potentially help develop a rapport with youth who went through the program, it didn't adequately cover the material itself.
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>C</b>	
Quality of the training received	<b>C</b>	
Availability of appropriate evaluation instruments and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>B</b>	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>C</b>	
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>B</b>	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>B</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Stay SMART and SMART Leaders are the components used for the target populations (13-16). Sessions are delivered in the class room during school hours and also during program hours of the Boys & Girls Club, so access to population is easy.
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>A</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>C</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>A</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	Handouts are included in Session Manuals. Related costs would just be the copying for the sessions that had handouts. For the amount of participants maybe \$15.00 would cover it.
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	The program itself is wonderful. The way the sessions are laid out in the manual makes it very easy for a facilitator to deliver the material with very little planning. The material itself includes everything from coping strategies to the influence of media and advertisement, assertiveness, etc. It includes informational games and activities that make it fun for the participants.
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>A</b>	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>A</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>B-C</b>	
Community receptivity to the program	<b>A</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>B</b>	
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	The only staffing requirement is a person to administer sessions
Overall satisfaction	<b>A</b>	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		

**Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program  
Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:  
STRENGTHENING FAMILIES FOR PARENTS & YOUTH, 10-14**

**Provider Name:  
ARAB-AMERICAN CHALDEAN COUNCIL**

**General Program Background**

Website: [www.extension.iastate.edu/sfp/](http://www.extension.iastate.edu/sfp/)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): UNIVERSAL

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): MODEL

Program Description: A substance abuse prevention curriculum for families with youth ages 10-14. The program is comprised of seven 2-hour sessions. The first hour of each session, parents and children are separated and the second hour the family is brought together for a range of activities and exercises. Parent topics include setting rules, encouraging good behavior, protecting against substance abuse, and using community resources. Youth topics include having goals and dreams, following rules, peer pressure, and reaching out to others.

**MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants: Arab-American and Chaldean families and youth, ages 10-14

Setting: Socio-economically stressed region of Detroit, and nearby regions where the target Arab/Chaldean population resides

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: For Arab/Chaldean parents/families who have limited English language skills, staff presented lessons and evaluation materials in Arabic.

## Assessment Format

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--” indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	It is very easy to find information on the program on the internet. The information is very accurate and helps explain the program and its outcome goals.
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>A</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>A</b>	
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	The training that our staff received for the Strengthening Families Program was provided by a certified trainer of the SFP. She currently directs another prevention agency that has been implementing the program for a number of years for an inner-city community of color in Detroit. The trainer included her own experiences with the program, which was very meaningful to us because she was able to provide insight in working with special populations such as ours.
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>B</b>	
Quality of the training received	<b>B</b>	
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	<p>The program developers have created an evaluation tool for the program. However, we did not use their tools because we were using the pre/post survey developed by PIRE. The developers provided all of the support that we needed and were able to answer any questions that we had.</p> <p>The cost of the local training was very minimal compared to the extensive costs that the developers charge. The certified trainer was already from our area, and charged a very nominal fee of \$300 for the training. We had already purchased the materials from the developers and had them on hand at the time of training.</p>

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	We received adequate support from the program developers relating to any questions about the program that we had. The developers always responded to our inquiries in a timely manner and were able to answer all the questions that we had.
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>A</b>	
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>Although a challenge, for the most part, we have not had a problem recruiting participants for this program. We have offered incentives, such as meals and small gifts, to the participating families.</p> <p>The program was implemented during the summer, and was easy to run and set up. One series was implemented at a school that we had been working with during the regular school year, and another series was implemented at one of the ACC, ESL (English as a Second Language) offices.</p> <p>The program was adaptable to meet the needs of our target population. However, it was necessary to translate the materials for the parent and family sessions into Arabic.</p> <p>Curriculum materials had been purchased from the previous year; therefore, no additional costs were incurred outside of making copies for the participants from existing materials. The curriculum cost was about \$680 when it was originally purchased</p> <p>Additional costs included transportation, meals and small prizes for the families that participated in the program. Thirty-eight families participated for the two years of the program implementation. Each family included an adult and a minimum of one child per family. Approximate costs per family:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transportation – \$ 50</li> <li>• Meals – \$ 45</li> <li>• Incentives – \$ 35</li> <li>• Copying – \$ 10</li> </ul>
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>A</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>A</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>B</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>B</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>Staff was very comfortable implementing the program and made sure that its fidelity was maintained. Staff was very pleased with the program and felt that it gave the target population a chance to communicate on a family level and provided both the youth and their parents with valuable skills that would help them understand each other's perspectives.</p> <p>At both implementation sites, program participants expressed this feedback. Most everyone was very interested in the program and actively participated in all of the activities.</p> <p>In terms of staff time required for implementation we feel that the program is appropriate. There is much to prepare for each session but staff was able to handle the responsibility. For each session, a minimum of three staff facilitated, one for the parent sessions, and two for the youth sessions. For the family segment, all staff assisted.</p>
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>A</b>	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>A</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>A</b>	
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>A</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>B</b>	<p>We are very pleased with the families' responsiveness to the Strengthening Families program. We found that the program was just as effective outside of the school setting as it was within the school.</p>
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Overall satisfaction	<b>A</b>	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		



**Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program  
Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:**  
**STRENGTHENING FAMILIES FOR PARENTS & YOUTH, 10-14**

**Provider Name:**  
**COPPER COUNTRY COALITION FOR A DRUG FREE COMMUNITY**

**General Program Background**

Website: [www.parentingwisely.com](http://www.parentingwisely.com)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): SELECTIVE, INDICATED

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): MODEL

Program Description: A substance abuse prevention curriculum for families with youth ages 10-14. The program is comprised of seven 2-hour sessions. The first hour of each session, parents and children are separated and the second hour the family is brought together for a range of activities and exercises. Parent topics include setting rules, encouraging good behavior, protecting against substance abuse, and using community resources. Youth topics include having goals and dreams, following rules, peer pressure, and reaching out to others.

**MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics): Predominantly white, families with youth ages 10-14

Setting: Four counties in the Western Upper Peninsula

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: None

## **Assessment Format**

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--“ indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

<b>Preparation &amp; Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings</b>		<b>Notes</b>
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	The SAMHSA website had information about the program.
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>A</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>A</b>	
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	The training was very helpful. Originally, training was received from regional trainers. Then staff received train the trainer from the developers of the program, and staff provided a training for additional local facilitators. The train-the-trainer session was very helpful and provided a lot of discussion about specific issues, and answers to local issues in implementation.
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the training received	<b>A</b>	
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers’ expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	It costs about \$3500 for training plus travel expenses. We found someone in our region who had received the train the trainer so it was cheaper. But, when we went through Train the Trainer this is what it cost. Now, we will be able to train trainers in our region.
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	The developers have called us every six months or so to see how things are going.
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>A</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>SFP participant recruitment has been somewhat difficult for each program offered. The most successful recruitment tactic has involved school personnel contacting individual families to discuss their participation in the program.</p> <p>SFP requires a great deal of preparation due to the large quantity of materials required for each session. This preparation time is increased significantly when the program is provided at a location other than the service provider agency. We purchased Rubbermaid containers with handles to hold each session so with round two, three and beyond it is much easier.</p> <p>There are some consumables in each session for participants to take home, but no costly workbook. It is very helpful to have the magnetic clips for parents so that they can hang the weekly take home card on their refrigerators. While there are no workbook there are a lot of handouts, props, family incentives, etc. that are needed. We did provide a meal at the beginning of each session.</p>
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>B</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>C</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>A</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>B</b>	
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>The number of participants directly impacts the fidelity of the program. Many activities cannot be implemented as prescribed by the program if several program participants are absent from any given session. Further, youth who exhibit behavior problems can make the implementation of some activities impossible.</p> <p>It is important to provide a disclaimer about the out-dated videos, so participants do not focus on this. The developers are planning to update them soon. The program requires an excessive amount of time for set-up, meal provision (critical), a two-hour program (if on schedule), and clean-up; the components are all essential for a successful program, but individual sessions and the overall program length push the limit of being realistic. We did one to three groups per year. During group you need someone to spend about 8 hours per week on the project organizing and being one of the three trainers. Then you need two additional trainers, so that would be an additional 6 or so hours each. If the sessions have not been organized as described above, it will take more time. When running more than one group per week some of the planning time can be split across the groups.</p>
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>B</b>	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>B</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>B</b>	
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>C</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>C</b>	
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>It seems critical to work in collaboration with personnel from local middle/junior high schools, i.e. principal, counselor, teachers, churches, etc.</p>
Overall satisfaction	<b>B</b>	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		

## **Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:**  
**STRENGTHENING FAMILIES FOR PARENTS & YOUTH, 10-14**

**Provider Name:**  
**PARTNERSHIP FOR A HEALTHY ALLEGAN COUNTY**

### **General Program Background**

Website: [www.extension.iastate.edu/sfp/](http://www.extension.iastate.edu/sfp/)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): UNIVERSAL

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): MODEL

Program Description: A substance abuse prevention curriculum for families with youth ages 10-14. The program is comprised of seven 2-hour sessions. The first hour of each session, parents and children are separated and the second hour the family is brought together for a range of activities and exercises. Parent topics include setting rules, encouraging good behavior, protecting against substance abuse, and using community resources. Youth topics include having goals and dreams, following rules, peer pressure, and reaching out to others.

### **MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics): Youth ages 10-14 and their parents; program implemented separately with predominantly white, English-speaking participants, and predominantly Hispanic/Latino, Spanish-speaking participants.

Setting: Community-based settings in rural Allegan County

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: Some sessions implemented with Spanish speaking parents and youth, whose families who may be monolingual Spanish, bilingual Spanish and English.

## Assessment Format

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--“ indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Information was easy to find through their website and contact with developers. Their program curriculum contains background information regarding evaluation and there are other supporting articles written regarding program use and effectiveness. Sample population that evaluation was based on was mainly Caucasian and included two parent households, therefore there is some questions regarding generalizing to more specific populations and cultural diversity.
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>A</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>B</b>	
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	The program has Before/Now survey and offers support to evaluate outcomes. Training is very thorough and is priced fairly. Can train many people with the training provided; yet this program needs many facilitators. The initial cost for a two or three day training- \$3,500 fee plus the trainer's airfare, ground travel, food, and lodging. If group is larger than 15, cost is doubled for an additional trainer. One advantage of training is that facilitators may be trained as Trainer of Trainers in their community. For this to happen there needs to be another training in order for TOT to go through and help teach a training just like the original trg. Costs would be the same for second trg. There is a lot of materials, props, time needed to complete a training.
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the training received	<b>A</b>	
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>B</b>	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>B</b>	Developers and trainers were helpful and available.
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Quality of the assistance received	<b>A</b>	

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>Recruitment of families to participate has been extremely difficult. Struggled with converting English version of program to Spanish, then recruiting families and adapting program to fit the needs of Hispanic population while maintaining program fidelity.</p> <p>Logistics to run program could be difficult based on the need for multiple rooms and space in the community</p> <p>The Manual of the program costs \$175, which is a one-time cost and can be used over and over. The manual is set up nicely but copies (made from the manual) for each group/program is time consuming. Marketing materials did not fit our needs, therefore flyers were also needed.</p>
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>C/D</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>B</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>C</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>C</b>	
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<p>Due to the number of families participating in particular groups, some components needed to be modified or shortened. For instance we had to change icebreaker activities that required more participants than we had, And, sometimes activities did not take as long as the developer suggested. The developers have said that this does not affect the validity of the program.</p> <p>Curriculum is laid out well enough that facilitators should be able to follow. Staff who facilitate program are generally enthusiastic. Participants who do complete the program have been very positive.</p> <p>Time commitment is an issue as a group for one evening generally takes about 3-4 hours. Staff requirements for this program include a full-time coordinator, 3 to 4 facilitators per group, and childcare workers. We paid facilitators and childcare workers a stipend in order to secure their time and commitment.</p>
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>B</b>	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>B</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>B</b>	
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>C</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>B</b>	<p>As this is a new program within our community, a good period of time (several years) is needed to market program and gather community interest. While the Strengthening Families Program is a beneficial program, it has also been costly to institute in our county with not as much participation and community involvement as first expected. This program would work better in a county/organization where referrals are direct.</p>
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Overall satisfaction	<b>C</b>	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		

**Michigan SIG Provider Assessments of Program  
Preparation and Implementation Issues**

**Program Name:  
STRENGTHENING FAMILIES FOR FAMILIES & YOUTH, 10-14**

**Provider Name:  
PREVENTION WORKS**

**General Program Background**

Website: [www.extension.iastate.edu/sfp/](http://www.extension.iastate.edu/sfp/)

Institute Of Medicine Category/ies (universal, selective, and/or indicated): UNIVERSAL

CSAP NREPP assessment (model, effective, or promising): MODEL

Program Description: A substance abuse prevention curriculum for families with youth ages 10-14. The program is comprised of seven 2 1/2-hour sessions. The first ½ hour of the session is a family style dinner. The following hour, parents and children are separated and the final hour the family is brought together for a range of activities and exercises. Parent topics include setting rules, encouraging good behavior, protecting against substance abuse, and using community resources. Youth topics include having goals and dreams, following rules, peer pressure, and reaching out to others.

**MI SIG Local Program Implementation**

Participants (description on age, gender, race, and other distinguishing characteristics):  
Racially diverse families with youth, ages 12-17

Setting: Community-based settings in greater Kalamazoo

Unusual/noteworthy aspects of the implementation conditions: None

## Assessment Format

The table on the following page presents satisfaction ratings and notes on preparation and implementation issues experienced by the Provider when implementing the Program as part of the MI SIG project. The ratings are based on one set of experiences with the Program, and therefore do not represent a comprehensive assessment of the Program (i.e., an assessment based on input from multiple providers in diverse circumstances). The information has been organized in the style of a report card to help others learn from the experiences of the Provider.

The following scale is used for the satisfaction ratings (“--” indicates that the issue was not applicable for this program implementation):

**A**                      **B**                      **C**                      **D**                      **F**  
 VERY SATISFIED                      > > > > > > > > >                      VERY DISSATISFIED

Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PROGRAM SELECTION</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The website is very helpful and has links to additional research about the program as well as recruitment tips and a sample budget.</li> <li>➤ The information was very realistic.</li> </ul>
Ease of finding information about the program	<b>A</b>	
Accuracy and usefulness of the information found	<b>A</b>	
<b>PROGRAM TRAINING</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Training is VERY expensive if you have the developers provide the training. However, they do have a Trainer of Trainers Program and we were able to contract with a certified agency to provide our training at a much lower cost.</li> <li>➤ The training we received from the Substance Abuse Council of Battle Creek was excellent. They provided a very in-depth training that included facilitator tips and recruitment/retention strategies. Each lesson was discussed in-depth and the activities were demonstrated to the participants which was very helpful.</li> <li>➤ The evaluation materials are on the developer's website and we have received adequate support from the program developer's and representatives.</li> <li>➤ For the developer to provide a 3-day training it is \$3,500 plus expenses, for a 2-day training it is \$2,500 plus expenses. If you attend a training offered by another agency it is \$300 per participant. Each trainer-of-trainer agency's cost will vary based on number of participants, etc.</li> </ul>
Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>B</b>	
Quality of the training received	<b>A</b>	
Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives	<b>A</b>	
Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.) – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	
<b>POST-TRAINING SUPPORT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	We have not needed any post-training support.
Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives	--	
Quality of the assistance received	--	



Preparation & Implementation Issues with Satisfaction Ratings		Notes
<b>PREPARATION FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ We have established a recruitment strategy for all of our SFP sites that has been working great! Having a multi-faceted approach to recruitment is critical. Plan on spending a lot of time recruiting and establishing referral sources. Once participants attend the program it is rather easy to get them to return for the next session.</li> <li>➤ Logistics of running this program is a time intensive task but once you have a set structure it is well worth the time. The other downfall is the amount of space necessary to run the program. You will need at least 3 separate rooms which makes offering the program at smaller churches and community sites more challenging. We have found that the program fits really well within our community. We do stress the importance of offering the meals, babysitting services, transportation and incentives.</li> <li>➤ You must purchase the curriculum and the videos which is a total cost of \$450. Once you have the curriculum you have permission to make the copies of handouts and game cards which is much more convenient than having to order the materials from the developer.</li> </ul>
Ease of recruiting participants	<b>B</b>	
Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)	<b>B</b>	
Ease of adapting program to fit local situation	<b>A</b>	
Value of materials <i>required</i> for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost – list actual cost information in Notes	<b>A</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The program/curriculum was developed well and is easy to follow.</li> <li>➤ The program facilitators absolutely love the program!</li> <li>➤ Once the participants attend a session they usually have fun and come back. Getting them to the first session is the tricky part. The videos used during the sessions could use some updating.</li> <li>➤ The community has been very receptive to this program. We have implemented the program at neighborhood centers, schools and other community organizations and currently have a waiting list for the program.</li> <li>➤ This program takes quite a bit of staff time but it is well worth it! A staff person is needed to organize and transport materials, recruit program participants, set up logistics with host sites, order/plan meals and arrange transportation. In addition the program requires one parent facilitator, two youth facilitators and at least 2-3 child care workers if childcare is offered.</li> </ul>
<b>PROGRAM DELIVERY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Ease of implementing program components with fidelity	<b>A</b>	
Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program	<b>A</b>	
Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions	<b>A</b>	
Community enthusiasm for the program	<b>A</b>	
Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time) – list actual staffing requirements in Notes	<b>A</b>	<p>Despite the fact that this program is more complicated than many other program to implement it is definitely worth every minute. This program is very rewarding!</p>
<b>LESSONS LEARNED</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
Overall satisfaction	<b>A</b>	
Input on appropriate populations, settings, etc. for successful implementation – Notes, but no rating		

## Appendix: Ratings Summary Chart

### List of Dimensions:

1. Ease of finding information about the program
2. Accuracy and usefulness of the information found
3. Ease of obtaining training from program developers and/or their representatives
4. Quality of the training received
5. Availability of appropriate evaluation materials and support from program developers and/or their representatives
6. Value of training relative to cost (materials, trainers' expenses, etc.)
7. Ease of obtaining help/technical assistance from program developers and/or their representatives
8. Quality of the assistance received
9. Ease of recruiting participants
10. Ease of setting up logistics to run program (collaborators, hiring staff, space, materials, time, etc.)
11. Ease of adapting program to fit local situation
12. Value of materials *required* for implementation (workbooks, etc.) relative to cost
13. Ease of implementing program components with fidelity
14. Provider staff enthusiasm about use of the program
15. Participant interest and involvement in all program sessions
16. Community enthusiasm for the program
17. Value of the program relative to the staff time required for implementation (direct and indirect time)
18. Overall satisfaction

Program/Provider	Rating Dimensions																	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
All Stars/Prevention Works, Inc.	A	A	A-	A	B	A	A	A	A	A	A-	B	A-	A	A-	A	A	A
CMCA/Copper Country	A	C	C	C	A	B	A	A	C	B	B	--	C	C	B	B	B	B
CMCA/Knopf Company	C	A	C	B	C	--	--	--	B	B	A	--	A	D	C	B	A	B
CMCA/Saginaw County YPC	B-	B	--	B	C-	B	C	C	B-	B-	C	B	--	B-	B-	B-	B-	B-
CMCA/SAC-Battle Creek	B	A	C	A	B	A	--	A	A	A	A	B	A	A	A	A	A	A
CMCA/Upper Peninsula Community Coalitions	A	A-	B	A-	B	B	--	--	B	B	B	A	B	B	B	B	A-	A-
Creating Lasting Family Connections/Cath HS	A	A	C	C	A	C	A	A	D	A	A	C	C	B	B	C	C	C
Healthy Families-Healthy Start/Easter Seals	A	A	B	A	B	A	A	A	A	B	A	A	A	A	A	B	B	A
Leadership & Resiliency Program/Copper Country	B	B	C	A	A	B	B	B	B	C	B	C	C	B	B	C	D	C
Life Skills Training/Arab-American Chaldean Council	B	B	--	--	A	--	A	A	B	B	B	B	A	B	C	B	B	B
Life Skills Training/Connexion, Inc.	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	C	C	A	A	A	A	A	B	A	A
Life Skills Training/Saginaw County	A-	B-	A	B-	C-	C-	B+	C	A	B	B	C-	C-	B-	B-	B	B-	C
Life Skills Training/Wedgwood Christian Services	A	A	A	A	--	A	F	F	A	A	A	--	B	B	B	A	A	A
Media Sharp/Washtenaw County	A	B+	--	--	--	--	--	--	A	A	A	B	C	B	B-	--	A	B
Minnesota Smoking Prevention Program/Prev Works	D	D	--	--	C	--	B	A-	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A-
Nurse-Family Partnership/Berrien County	B	A	B	A	A	A	A+	A+	B	B	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
Nurturing Parenting Program/Easter Seals	A	A	A	B	C	B	B	B	B	C	A	C	A	A	A	B	A	A
Parenting Wisely/Center for Human Resources	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	--	--	--	--	A	A	B	B	B	--
Parenting Wisely/Copper Country	A	A	--	--	--	--	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	C	B	A
Project Alert/Arab-American Chaldean Council	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	B	A	A	A	A	B	B	A	A	A
Project Alert/Center for Human Resources	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	B	A	A	A	A	A	A	B	A	A
Project Alert/Warren-Conner Development Coalition	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	C	B	C	A	A	A	B	C	B	B
Project SUCCESS/BASIS, Inc.	A-	B-	A-	A-	B+	B+	A-	A-	B	B	B	B	B	A	A-	A-	A	B+
Project SUCCESS/Center for Human Resources	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	B	A	A	A
Project Toward No Drug Abuse/SAC-Battle Creek	A	B-	A	C	--	A	B	C-	A	A	B	C	B	A	B	A	A	A-
Reconnecting Youth/CARE of Macomb	A	A	B	A	A	C	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	A	A	B	B	B
Second Step/Connexion, Inc.	A	A	A	A	B	A	A	A	D	D	C	C	B	B	B	B	C	B+
SMART Moves/Boys & Girls Club of Bay Mills	A	A	C	C	B	C	B	B	A	C	A	A	A	A	B-	A	B	A
Strengthening Families/Arab-Chaldean Council	A	A	B	B	A	A	A	A	A	A	B	B	A	A	A	A	B	A
Strengthening Families/Copper Country	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	B	C	A	B	B	B	B	C	C	B
Strengthening Families/Partnership for Allegan County	A	B	A	A	B	B	A	A	C-	B	C	C	B	B	B	C	B	C
Strengthening Families/Prevention Works, Inc.	A	A	B	A	A	A	--	--	B	B	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A